



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago  
Loyola eCommons

---

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

---

2017

## Love and Loyal Actions': Ritual Affect and Royal Authority, 1688-1760

Amy Oberlin  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)

 Part of the [History Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Oberlin, Amy, "Love and Loyal Actions': Ritual Affect and Royal Authority, 1688-1760" (2017).  
*Dissertations*. 2835.  
[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/2835](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2835)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).  
Copyright © 2017 Amy Oberlin

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

"LOVE AND LOYAL ACTIONS":  
RITUAL AFFECT AND ROYAL AUTHORITY,  
1688-1760

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN HISTORY

BY

AMY B. OBERLIN

CHICAGO, IL

AUGUST 2017

Copyright by Amy Oberlin, 2017  
All rights reserved.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of a large number of people. My dissertation supervisor, Robert Bucholz, took me on as his student shortly after I entered the Ph.D. program in 2010. However, his influence and inspiration in my life began at the very start of my graduate studies when I took his Early Modern England class as a new graduate student studying for my Master's degree in medieval history. His passion for his topic reignited my own interest in the period. His kindness and dedication to all of his students was evident and inspiring from the beginning. I could seriously write an entire essay on what this generous and brilliant man has meant in my life. He has been a demanding but kind mentor, and, whether he intended to or not, a life coach. He is the exemplar of a diligent, dedicated and brilliant scholar, as well as a kind and patient person. In short, he is a model human being and I am more grateful than I can express that he agreed to be my mentor.

Professor John Donoghue's dedication to his own work and the role of history in furthering social justice in broader society should serve as an inspiration to all aspiring historians. I am proud to have him on my committee and grateful for his input in this project - and the copious amounts of cheerleading he has provided over the course of my graduate career.

I also want to thank Ellen McClure for agreeing to serve on my committee, even though I ended up abandoning the French portion of the research, which I imagine interested her most. Her input will be invaluable as I endeavor to turn this dissertation into a book.

The History Department at Loyola certainly has some amazing professors, who apparently attract some of the most wonderful students, many of whom have also contributed to this project over the years. There are too many to name here, so I'll start by thanking all of my fellow graduate students with whom I've had the pleasure of discussing classes, hashing through research or venting about schedules. Dr. Thomas Green took me under his wing when I was a rookie M.A. student, who had no idea what I was getting into. Over the years he provided support and mentorship as I navigated the often alien landscape of graduate study. I can't thank him enough for both his guidance and his friendship. Dr. Andrew Donnelly has also been a wonderfully supportive friend throughout my graduate career. I want to thank Dr. Steven Catania, my fellow Bucholz-mentee, for the many discussions of our research that helped me flush out aspects of this project and for last-minute edits that helped me meet deadlines. Dr. Anthony Di Lorenzo, Dr. Peter Kotowski both organized and participated in the English Atlantic Writing Group, which drew an excellent group of scholars, including Professor Jim Sack and others already mentioned here, and expanded my perspective on my own work and on the field more broadly. Dr. Amelia Serafine, Will Ippen, Katie Macica, Hope Shannon, and all the others who attended the Dissertation Writing Group have been especially patient in reviewing my rough drafts and are wonderfully supportive colleagues and friends. Last, but certainly not least, is Dr. Erin Feichtinger, whose energy and passion is contagious. From our 2014 research trip to London to this very moment when she is helping me format this dissertation so that I don't curse myself sick, Erin has been a wonderful colleague, editor, drinking buddy and friend. She is

brilliant, generous and kind. If you are fortunate enough to call her friend, you are one lucky bastard. But fortune has certainly blessed you, if you have had the opportunity to perform *The Rocky Horror Picture Show* with her in your living room.

Despite the support of all my wonderful colleagues and friends, a dissertation does not get written on beer and sympathy alone. I want to thank Loyola University for providing me with both fellowships and teaching opportunities to help me meet the monetary demands of adult life, while pursuing my studies. For those times when such support was not possible, I had the great luck of working part-time with a wonderful team at Kroll Associates, Inc. I am especially grateful to Mark Skertic, Jeff Cramer, Lisa Silverman, Stephanie Gardner, Baltazar Vallenilla, Aneta Olszynska, Rachel Robinson and Margot Klepetko for their understanding and support over the years, not to mention their patience with my ever-varying schedules and vast leaves of absence.

Finally and most importantly, the person who has undoubtedly borne the brunt of the ups and downs that led to this project is my best friend and partner, Rob Patterson. He has listened to every presentation, every awkward sentence, every half-formed theory and absolutely every single anxiety. He has toasted my achievements and provided a shoulder to cry on. He is the love of my life, and without his love and support, completing this dissertation would have been utterly impossible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION: MONARCHS, PUBLICS AND EMOTIONS, 1660-1760	1
CHAPTER TWO: "SPRINGS OF EACH VIRTUOUS ACTION": PASSIONS AND PIETY IN EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND	27
CHAPTER THREE: "SHARE WITH ME IN MY GRIEF AND AFFLICTION": ROYAL DEATH AND PUBLIC MOURNING	70
CHAPTER FOUR: "A KIND OF MARRIAGE DAY": ACCESSION, CORONATION AND AFFECTIVE UNITY	119
CHAPTER FIVE: ROYAL MARRIAGE IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES	164
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION	209
BIBLIOGRAPHY	213
VITA	232

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: <i>Hibernia in Universal Mourning</i>	118
Figure 2: William Kent, <i>The Wedding of Princess Anne</i>	208



## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### MONARCHS, PUBLICS AND EMOTIONS: 1660-1760

This project began with the intent to discover a more precise measurement of the eighteenth-century court's place in the social and cultural shifts of the eighteenth century. Inspired in part by the dominance that emotions have come to wield over modern U.S. politics, I use emotions as a litmus. Through modern news outlets and social media, modern politicians in the U.S. and elsewhere have become master emotional manipulators - at least the successful ones have.<sup>1</sup> People were no less gullible in the eighteenth century, but the communication apparatus was far less developed. The explosion of print culture, however, created a new and ever-expanding means through which the monarchy could communicate with the public. This project seeks to understand how the last Stuart and first Hanoverian monarchs, who reigned during the proliferation of print in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, employed this new mode of communication to influence hearts and minds.

The story of the British monarchy, especially during this period, is one of change versus continuity. From 1660 to 1760, monarchs and their courts navigated changing political and social circumstances while attempting to maintain the illusion of continuity. This period was a rollercoaster of dynastic change. In 1660, Charles II returned to the throne with much fanfare, following an interregnum of Parliamentary rule. He died in 1685, having produced no legitimate

---

<sup>1</sup> See, Drew Westin, *The Political Brain: The Role of Emotion in Deciding the Fate of a Nation* (New York, NY: PublicAffairs, 2007).

children, so the crown went to his brother James II. James was openly Catholic and his rule was hotly contested.<sup>2</sup> In 1688, James' Catholic wife gave birth to a son and rumors swirled that the child was not Mary's, but had been smuggled into the queen's bedroom in a warming pan.<sup>3</sup> This, in addition to James' insistence on toleration for Catholics, motivated some members of Parliament to invite the Dutch husband of James' elder daughter Mary to come to England's aid. In late 1688, William III arrived in England with Dutch military support. James sent his wife away and then fled himself in December 1688. Two months later, in February 1688/9, Parliament declared William and Mary king and queen of England.<sup>4</sup> Because they had been appointed by Parliament, William and Mary relinquished some of the crown's power, agreeing to a new coronation oath that recognized the power of Parliament.<sup>5</sup> Mary died in 1694, and her husband followed in 1701/2, leaving the throne to Mary's younger sister, Anne. Before William died, however, he signed the Act of Succession (1701), which ensured a Protestant succession to the crown. This barred the exiled James Stuart, the infant of the warming pan, from ascending the throne. When Queen Anne died in 1714 leaving no surviving children, her cousin, the

---

<sup>2</sup> On the Exclusion Crisis, see: Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-1681* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Melinda S. Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010); Julie Ellison, *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

<sup>3</sup> On the warming pan scandal, see: John Miller, *James II* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978); Rachel J. Weil, "The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming-Pan Scandal," in *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives*, ed. Lois G. Schworer (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 65-82.

<sup>4</sup> These events are otherwise known as the "Glorious Revolution," which has been a topic of much debate among historians: W.A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1988); Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Glorious Revolution* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000); Steve Pincus, *1688: the First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009); Colin Brooks, "The Revolution of 1688-1690," in *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 436-54.

<sup>5</sup> See Chapter Four below.

German Georg Ludwig, ascended the throne, becoming George I. This created the Hanoverian dynasty, which would remain on the throne until 1837.<sup>6</sup>

Throughout these tumults, the monarchy also faced growing divisions among the political elite. Parties became an especially potent force during Queen Anne's reign.<sup>7</sup> To manage Parliament and maintain power, the crown needed to maintain its hold over the hearts of the people. The extent to which monarchs succeeded at this has been widely debated. Linda Colley asserts that "from the Revolution of 1688 until the end of the eighteenth century, royal propagandists and courtiers made little consistent endeavour to foster a popular cult of the monarchy."<sup>8</sup> Kevin Sharpe has recently argued that the last Stuarts maintained a position at the center of political and public life through their manipulation of the royal image.<sup>9</sup> This dissertation analyzes some of the ways in which the late Stuart and early Hanoverian monarchies used perhaps more subtle ways of creating and promoting loyalist culture.

This project analyzes the primary point of contact between the monarch and the public sphere - royal ceremonial - to examine how the court communicated with the public. To do this, I examine the ceremonial forms, printed pamphlets, broadsides, sermons, and newspapers during the reigns spanning 1660 to 1760. Methodologically, I draw from the vast body of literature on ritual and power, including work by sociologists, anthropologists, and historians; studies on the

---

<sup>6</sup> As a woman, Victoria was barred from inheriting Hanover, so the Hanoverian rule in Britain was ended: Michael Schaich, "Introduction," in *The Hanoverian Succession: Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture*, eds. Andreas Gestrich and Michael Schaich (Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2015), 22.

<sup>7</sup> On the rise of party, see especially: Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London: Macmillan, 1967); J.H. Plumb, *The Growth of Political Stability in England, 1675-1725* (London: MacMillan Press, 1967); Tim Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715* (London: Longman Press, 1993).

<sup>8</sup> Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 201.

<sup>9</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Have, CT: Yale University Press, 2013).

cultural and political power of the public sphere; changing royal ideals; the history of gendered ideals; the history of the body; and the history of emotions. An analysis of the affective rhetoric used in individual reports of royal ceremony, for both personal and public consumption, shows that the monarch's power, as seen through notions of the relationship between ruler and ruled, did not decline during the reigns of the last Stuarts; rather, the public's relationship to the ruler became more personal, and the monarch, more accessible, conceptually if not physically. Though this outlines a shift in the traditional conceptions of royal power, it does not necessitate a "decline" in that power. Instead, the monarch's place shifted from the court to the public sphere, as traditional ideas of divine right monarchy were eroded by the realities of a monarch who was far from god-like. It was during this period that the monarch transformed from a distant figure to be feared, to a protector, both capable and worthy of love. Through this lens of emotion, I shed light on the ways the relationship between monarch and subject went from one of cold distance to one of accessibility. Over the course of the early eighteenth century, the monarchy became one to which its subjects could relate, it became more human.

Looking at the problem of the decline of the court from the outside will reconcile existing narratives that are at odds about the decline of the court as the center of culture in eighteenth-century England. Historians of the later Stuart courts argue that the story of the post 1688 monarchy is one of decline in the court's position as arbiter of culture.<sup>10</sup> The notion that the court in the early eighteenth-century ceased to be the center of cultural life is intimately connected to notions of kingship. The argument that people ceased coming to court entails a loss in what some

---

<sup>10</sup> Most notably, Bucholz, *Augustan Court*. Also, Alan Marshall, *The Age of Faction: Court Politics, 1660-1702* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); Michael Foss, *The Age of Patronage: The Arts in England, 1660-1750* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1971); and John Brewer characterizes the court's loss of cultural influence as a liberation of the arts in idem, *Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

scholars call the royal “charisma”, that is, the essence of royal power.<sup>11</sup> As the public sphere gained importance, the locus of power shifted away from the monarch to Parliament.<sup>12</sup> The press proliferated during this period, creating new ways for people to become knowledgeable, active participants in politics. Print was cheap, and literacy levels were on the rise.<sup>13</sup> The court became increasingly aware of the utility of the press, and frequently used it as a means of propaganda.<sup>14</sup> This expansion of the press made it possible for subjects as far away as the American colonies to participate in royal ceremony.<sup>15</sup>

Reports of royal ceremonies, whether in broadsides or lavish commemorative texts, are laden with emotional language. Modern historians likewise use emotive language to describe the function of ceremony. The study of ceremony has moved past the notion that the sole function of royal ritual was propaganda as more and more scholars look to the work of sociologists and anthropologists to understand its role in early modern politics. David Cannadine and others (who

---

<sup>11</sup> On charisma see Max Weber, *Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans and ed., Talcott Parsons (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1947, 1964); and Clifford Geertz, “Centers, Kings, Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power,” in *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*, Idem. (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1983), 121-146.

<sup>12</sup> Lawrence E. Klein, “Coffeehouse Civility, 1660-1714: An Aspect of Post-Courtly Culture in England,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 59:1 (1996): 30-51; Steven Pincus and Peter Lake, eds., *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007); Alan Houston and Steven Pincus, eds. *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

<sup>13</sup> Geoff Baker and Ann McGruer, eds. *Readers, Audiences and Coteries in Early Modern England* (Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2006); Robert B. Shoemaker, *The London Mob: Violence and Disorder in Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Hambledon & London, 2004), 242.

<sup>14</sup> Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996); Benjamin F. Klein, “‘The Splendor of this Solemnity’: Royal Ceremony and Celebration in Late Stuart England, 1660-1714,” (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 2002).

<sup>15</sup> Brendan McConville, *The King’s Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

rely on Geertz) see ceremony as a type of power in itself.<sup>16</sup> My analysis rests on the notion that the root of this power was the cultivation of the relationship between ruler and ruled. These relationships were necessary for the monarch to maintain power, especially in the context of the increasingly politicized public sphere.

After the rule of William III, who overtly eschewed public ritual, Queen Anne made a conscious attempt to reinvigorate the court by reviving court ceremony. R. O. Bucholz argues that this attempt ultimately failed to capture the interest of her elite, target audience.<sup>17</sup> This, in turn, led to the decline of the court as the focus of cultural and political power. Historians of the early Hanoverian period, however, maintain that the court continued to be the center of political power.<sup>18</sup> According to Hannah Smith, Anne's court was the last to use imagery and language associated with divine-right monarchy<sup>19</sup>; yet, this image was weakened in ways similar to those that have been identified for her nemesis, Louis XIV.<sup>20</sup> Over the course of her many tragic pregnancies, it became increasingly apparent that God was not on her side. Her successor was chosen by Parliament, through legal process, not, as it seemed, by divine ordination. This necessitated a new ideal of monarchy, and a different approach to the relationship between

---

<sup>16</sup> David Cannadine, "Introduction: Divine Rites of Kings," in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, eds., idem and Simon Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

<sup>17</sup> R.O. Bucholz, "'Nothing but Ceremony': Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual," *The Journal of British Studies* 30:3 (July, 1991): 288-323.

<sup>18</sup> J.M. Beattie, *The English Court in the Reign of George I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967); Hannah Smith, *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, , 2006).

<sup>19</sup> Hannah Smith, "'Last of all the Heavenly Birth': Queen Anne and Sacral Queenship," *Parliamentary History* (2009); Smith notes that Anne was, herself somewhat ambivalent about this, Ibid, 138; Smith also cites J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1990).

<sup>20</sup> Ellen M. McClure, *Sunspots and the Sun King: Sovereignty and Mediation in Seventeenth-Century France* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2006), esp. 254.

sovereign and subject. Though George I is often described as a man who had little inclination to continue Anne's ceremonial agenda, he did participate in ritual over the course of his reign. Further, he and his court made considerable efforts to reach out to the public sphere to gain popular support. Though his son, George II was arguably more successful at interacting with the public, George I's efforts suggests more than monarchical whim. Instead of using the symbolic language of distance so apparent in divine-right ritual, the Hanoverians reached out to their subjects on a more personal level, and they responded in kind. I show that this change in monarchical style was a direct result of the apparent shift in public expectations of the monarchy. George reacted to popular expectations that no longer centered on a distant, divinely-ordained monarch. It was a monarchical style that would finally reach fruition, as scholars have noted, in the hands of George III.<sup>21</sup> It is precisely for this reason that my analysis is limited to the period before George III's accession in 1760.

Charles II is widely known to have been a charismatic figure. Robert Bucholz has noted the king used emotions to control his courtiers.<sup>22</sup> While this was effective among the court elite, his successors needed to extend their control beyond those in attendance at court. As the public sphere grew in power and influence, it became ever more important for monarchs to reach out to their subjects, which they did through the press, through ceremony and increasingly, through emotions. The press described monarchs and their ceremonies in very deliberate emotive terms. At Anne's succession, the late William III was described as a "Master of the affections of his

---

<sup>21</sup> Linda Colley, "The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty, and the British Nation 1760-1820," *Past and Present* 102 (1984), 94-129; Marilyn Morris, *The British Monarchy and the French Revolution* (New Have, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); Smith, *Georgian Monarchy*.

<sup>22</sup> Robert Bucholz, "The Art of the Restoration Courtier: the Evidence of Three Diaries," Presentation, Society for Court Studies Conference, *Charles II: King, Court and Culture*, University of Greenwich, England, May 8, 2010. I want to thank Professor Bucholz for sharing this presentation with me.

people...and likewise Master of himself for the Command he had over his Passions.”<sup>23</sup> Such language has been ignored, or taken for granted, by historians of the period. I argue that this is a remnant of certain discourses in the eighteenth century that described reason as the antithesis of emotions. The combination of a tradition of defining the eighteenth century as the “Age of Reason,” and Habermas’ construction of the public sphere as, in its nature, “rational”, have led historians to disregard emotional language as unimportant, mere boilerplate. Studies of emotions in eighteenth century America have shown that the use of emotional language was integral to colonial politics and, most importantly, the ways that colonial subjects viewed their relationship to their distant monarch. Such studies speak to the utility of this approach.<sup>24</sup>

The impact of affective rhetoric in political discourse relies heavily on broader cultural attitudes. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, religion was at the heart of debates over both emotions and politics. With the exception of James II, all monarchs in this study were described as Protestant crusaders, whose main enemies were Catholic France and the equally Catholic “pretender”, who was also frequently in France. Protestant ideals, formed in conscious opposition to Catholic ideals, were a main factor in the monarch’s relationship with the populace. These monarchs emphasized their Protestant fortitude in images intended for the public; but the public was also heavily influenced by their Protestant zeal and this formed the basis for their conceptions of their relationship to their sovereign. As Anglican divines came to embrace emotions, monarchs used affective language to bolster loyalty and create a culture of affective exchange between sovereign and subject.

---

<sup>23</sup> *Post Boy* (March 7-March 10, 1702).

<sup>24</sup> McConville, *King’s Three Faces*; Nicole Eustace, *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).



## I. Historiography

At the foundation of this study are two long-debated ideas: that concerning the emergence of the public sphere and that concerning the decline (or subsistence) of the court in the early eighteenth century. Each of these discourses were heavily influenced by the work of sociologists Jürgen Habermas and Norbert Elias, respectively. Habermas' theory of the public sphere has persisted in fuelling debate among historians much longer than Elias' theory of royal hegemony in the "civilizing process", though it is only marginally less teleological. These two debates have intersected relatively little, but, as I will show, they are intimately connected.

Jürgen Habermas' *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* has occupied many scholarly careers since its publication in English in 1989. Since then, scholars have grappled with various aspects of Habermas' original theory that posited the emergence of a rational-critical, politically-engaged public sphere in England in the beginning of the eighteenth century. Items up for debate have included the creation of an actual coherent bourgeois *mentalité*, the brevity or lengthiness of this transformation, and precisely when it took place.<sup>25</sup> What scholars do seem to agree on, however, is that this transformation happened first in England, sometime between the late seventeenth century and the end of the eighteenth. Most recently, Steven Pincus and Peter Lake have argued that the emergence of the public sphere was a long process, and one hindered by the perceived suspicion of "popularity." It was after 1688, however, that the public sphere emerged "full fledged," and became the dominant force in English society.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> A summary of these debates would require a much lengthier study than this one. Craig Calhoun, ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1992); Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, "Rethinking the Public Sphere," *Journal of British Studies* (April 2006): 270-292.

<sup>26</sup> Lake and Pincus, esp. 284; Also printed in Eadem, eds., *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern*

While Habermas' theory created a flurry of new scholarship, it has also perpetuated dichotomies that have proven restrictive. The growing influence of the public sphere over the course of the early eighteenth century is now a general consensus among scholars of the period. Political power in the eighteenth century was once seen as solely the province of the elite.<sup>27</sup> Lawrence Stone contends that it was the "underlying unity of the elites, and...the largely unquestioning habits of deference by those below, that the state apparatus could remain so relatively weak in eighteenth-century England without a total collapse of social order."<sup>28</sup> Recent scholars, especially H. T. Dickinson and Mark Knights, have started to show that the elites were not the only ones with political agency.<sup>29</sup> There has been some debate about the nature of the nascent public sphere, but most historical accounts tend to rest on Habermas' original construction. That is, that political agency was gained through growing rational-critical discourse in the press and coffeehouses. The movement started among the landed classes, but eventually trickled down, leading to the creation of the new, engaged bourgeoisie. As more scholars turned their attention to Habermas' theory it became clear that as the level of engagement among the masses grew, the public sphere became increasingly complex and variegated. Despite the acknowledged disorderly characteristic of the public sphere, scholars seem attached to Habermas' original characterization of it as rational. Studies that seek to put the agency behind

---

*England* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007). Pincus explores the notion of 1688 as the great "modernizer" in his *magnum opus*: *Idem, 1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).

<sup>27</sup> J.H. Plumb, *The Growth of Political Stability in England, 1675-1725* (London: Macmillan, 1967).

<sup>28</sup> Lawrence Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (London: Penguin Books, 1977; reprint, 1990), 151.

<sup>29</sup> H.T. Dickinson, *The Politics of the People in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995); esp. Mark Knights, "Public Politics in England c. 1675-c. 1715," in *The English Revolution c. 1590-1720: Politics, Religion, and Communities*, Nicholas Tyacke, ed., 169-84 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

historical events in the hands of the masses consistently insist that the resulting actions were critical, reasonable, and by no means driven by tradition.<sup>30</sup>

Another problem that has resulted from closer scrutiny of Habermas' theory is that of terminology. Habermas assumed a stark contrast between "public" and "private", but many historians have taken this to task. Even before the publication of Habermas' *Structural Transformation*, Lawrence Stone postulated that there was a growing desire for privacy as family life became more focused on the modern notion of the nuclear family, rather than the extended family.<sup>31</sup> In the 1990s, the debate over "public" and "private" was taken up by gender historians in their discourse about the place of a separate, female sphere in early modern society.<sup>32</sup> They concluded that these spheres were not as starkly divided as Habermas' theory suggests. These conclusions further serve as a warning to avoid anachronism in our interpretation of language. "Private" did not have the same connotation for men and women in the eighteenth century as it does for us. Paul Fritz's work provides a helpful example. He shows that the word "private" appeared more frequently in arrangements for royal funerals over the course of the eighteenth century, but the use of the term "private" in these documents referred to a decrease in the use of

---

<sup>30</sup> The most blatant of these Whig historians is undoubtedly Steven Pincus, especially in his *1688*. There are also historians whose work counters this teleological view, especially, Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in a European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

<sup>31</sup> Lawrence Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1977; Penguin Books, 1990).

<sup>32</sup> Anne Laurence, *Women in England 1500-1760* (Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1994; Phoenix Press, 1996); Sarah Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England, 1550-1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998). The argument for separate spheres, exemplified in Mendelson and Crawford's work, was fuelled by the desire to reclaim women's place in history, and argued for a new history focused completely on the female sphere. Vickery's work suggests that society was more complex, and that lines between the "private" domestic sphere and the "public" sphere of male business were not so separate.

grandiose ritual surrounding these funerals.<sup>33</sup> While we see these terms in specific, modern definitions, “public” and “private” meant very different things to an eighteenth century audience.

Stark conceptual divisions between “public” and “private” have been abandoned for more fluid constructions that see society as composed of multiple overlapping spheres. Their former separation, however, has left its mark on debates about the court’s place in society. The court is traditionally defined as the household of the monarch, which necessarily places it at a distance from the “public”. Different theories about the court’s place in the sociopolitical world of early modern England have led to varied ideas about its structure and function. Four decades ago, court historians focused mainly on the physical structure of the court and concluded that its primary function was as a point of contact between monarch and subject. Through this view the court was a point of contact for a select few, but separated the monarch from the majority of his or her subjects.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, the rise in political agency among those outside the court has often been viewed as peripheral to political activity within the court.

In their efforts to chart the process through which the court, and thus the monarch became peripheral to the nation’s power center, historians of royal decline have focused most often on aspects of the court itself. The two most important scholars of early eighteenth-century courts have reached different conclusions, seemingly at odds with one another. R. O. Bucholz’s study of Queen Anne’s court, confirms some previously-held notions about Queen Anne’s reign and its place in history as the final catalyst for court decline. Rather than looking strictly at court

---

<sup>33</sup> Paul Fritz, “From ‘Public’ to ‘Private’: The Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1830,” in *Mirrors of Morality: Studies in the Social History of Death*, ed. J. Whaley (Europa, 1981), 61 – 79.

<sup>34</sup> This structural view of the court crossed dynastic boundaries: G. R. Elton, Presidential Address: “Tudor Government: The Points of Contact. III. The Court,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5:26 (1976): 211-228; G.R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956, reprint, 1962); Beattie, *The English Court*.

structure or royal personality, as so many other scholars have done, Bucholz's study considers the court as a whole, taking into account the limitations created by factors, such as financial and health constraints, largely beyond the monarch's control.<sup>35</sup>

Where Bucholz and other scholars of the later Stuarts see post-Restoration court culture as necessarily one of decline, Hanoverian scholars maintain that the court continued to be a political and cultural center under George I and George II. J.M. Beattie concluded that the physical structure of the court, specifically the creation of the withdrawing room, maintained the court's place at the center of English social and political life.<sup>36</sup> His student, Hannah Smith, seeks to show the centrality of the Hanoverian courts through an analysis of court culture. Smith's study does place the court in its proper relation to the public sphere, to some extent, but remains largely focused on top-down court initiative. Her examination of loyalist culture outside of the metropolis reveals varied uses of the royal name and image, sometimes outside of the monarch's control.<sup>37</sup> She does, however, admit that more work needs to be done on "the links between the monarchy, the press and the public sphere during this period."<sup>38</sup> Smith's argument for a politically vibrant court is at odds with Bucholz's thesis of decline under the Stuarts. Examining the ways that Anne and George were portrayed in the public sphere will reveal whether the court declined in the eyes of the crowd.

---

<sup>35</sup> R. O. Bucholz, *The Augustan Court: Queen Anne and the Decline of Court Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993). On the importance of court structure: G.R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution*. For previous arguments about court decline based on royal personality (or lack thereof): David Loades, *The Tudor Court* (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1986; revised edition, Plymouth: Latimer Trend & Co., 1992); David Starkey, "Intimacy and Innovation: The Rise of the Privy Chamber, 1485-1547," in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, eds. David Starkey, D. A. L. Morgan, John Murphy, Pam Wright, Neil Cuddy and Kevin Sharpe (London and New York: Longman, 1987), 71-118.

<sup>36</sup> Beattie, *The English Court*.

<sup>37</sup> Smith, *Georgian Monarchy*, esp. 123.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 247, nt. 3

The primary point of contact between the monarch and the public sphere was ceremony. Royal ritual has received attention from scholars of different disciplines, especially in the second half of the twentieth century, after the success of the Third Reich drew attention to the power of ritual.<sup>39</sup> The first historian to see ritual as a way to examine society, and not just for sheer antiquarian curiosity, was Marc Bloch. His *Les rois thaumaturges*, a work accused by contemporaries as being “la victime d’une curiosité bizarre et somme toute assez futile,”<sup>40</sup> analyzed contemporary beliefs surrounding royal “touching” ceremonies and their implications for views of monarchy in France and England, suggesting a sacral element to notions of kingship.<sup>41</sup> Bloch’s work has proven to be ground-breaking both for the study of pre-modern political theory, as well as the study of ceremony. It demonstrated the importance of ceremony in understanding political theories, and its utility in the study of *mentalité*.

Later scholars such as Ernst Kantorowicz, Sergio Bertelli and Gábor Klaniczay explored the importance of the divine-right theories of kingship in the medieval and early modern periods.<sup>42</sup> These authors variously argue that during the middle ages and into the early modern period, royal power was conceived of as an extension of the divine. Scholars of the seventeenth

---

<sup>39</sup> On this inspiration, see especially David I. Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics and Power* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988).

<sup>40</sup> André Burguière, “L’anthropologie historique,” in Jacques Le Goff, ed, *La Nouvelle Histoire* (Éditions Complexe, Brussels, 1988), 143.

<sup>41</sup> Marc Bloch, *Les rois thaumaturges. Etude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre* (Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l’Université de Strasbourg, 19; Strasbourg, 1924). English translation: *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France*, trans. J.E. Anderson (London, 1973).

<sup>42</sup> Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997); Sergio Bertelli, *The King’s Body: Sacred Rituals of Power in Early Modern Europe* (University Park, PA: The Penn State University Press, 1990); Gábor Klaniczay: *The Uses of Supernatural Power: The Transformation of Popular Religion in Medieval and Early-Modern Europe*, trans. Susan Singerman (Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press and Blackwell, 1990); also, John Bossy, *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

and eighteenth centuries, especially in England, have discovered that this created problems as the sacral structures of divine-right monarchy were called increasingly into question. The debate over the power of monarchical authority is directly connected to that over the crown's sacrality. John Brewer argues that Charles I's execution in 1649 marked the final desacralization of the crown.<sup>43</sup> Kevin Sharpe's recent study of royal "branding" in the early Stuart period suggests the opposite. Instead of seeing Charles' execution as a sign of monarchical weakness, it was the king's "final victory in the contest for cultural authority [which] is evident in the fact that Charles was sentenced to death without due process and with even many on parliament's side questioning the legality and popularity of the verdict."<sup>44</sup> Sharpe sees the speediness with which the king's trial and execution were handled as evidence of the king's successful campaign to gain public support.

Others also point to evidence that the later Stuarts both perceived and portrayed themselves as divine-right monarchs. Anna Keay notes that Charles II continued to touch for the king's evil to reinforce his position as divinely-ordained monarch.<sup>45</sup> Smith argues that Anne's court was the last monarch to use imagery that specifically eluded to the sovereign's divine ordination.<sup>46</sup> These arguments concerning the sacrality of early modern sovereignty are most often based on ceremonial evidence.

---

<sup>43</sup> John Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), esp. 235.

<sup>44</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), 540.

<sup>45</sup> Anna Keay, *Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (London: Continuum Books, 2008), 70.

<sup>46</sup> Scholars of every reign from Charles I to George III have tackled this question. See especially, Hannah Smith, "'Last of all the Heavenly Birth': Queen Anne and Sacral Queenship," *Parliamentary History* (2009).

As more scholars turned their attention to the place of ceremony in modern and pre-modern societies, Bloch's work has come to be seen as a major breakthrough in our understanding of ritual. In the past two decades, scholars such as John Adamson, Peter Burke, David Cannadine, and Dougal Shaw have called for a re-examination of the uses of court ritual. Working under the influence of anthropological paradigms such as that forwarded by Clifford Geertz in the 1980s, they argue that court pageantry was not merely propaganda.<sup>47</sup> My work will follow that of Geertz and Cannadine who argue that "ritual is not a mask of force, but is itself a type of power."<sup>48</sup>

Scholars of political ritual have come to different conclusions about the nature of its power. Some have argued that ceremony is a means to instruct the crowd, while others have argued that it was a means of communication between monarch and subjects, used specifically to enforce princely authority. For some historians of royal ritual, the power of ceremonial is its ability to create and maintain the relationship between subject and sovereign.<sup>49</sup> This project

---

<sup>47</sup> John Adamson, "The Making of the Ancien-Régime Court 1500-1700," in *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture under the Ancien Régime 1500-1700* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1999); Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992); David Cannadine, "Introduction: Divine Rites of Kings," in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, idem and Simon Price, eds (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Dougal Shaw, "Nothing but Propaganda? Historians and the Study of Early Modern Royal Ritual," *Cultural and Social History - The Journal of the Social History Society* 1:2 (2004): 139-158.; Clifford Geertz, "Centers, Kings, Charisma." The problems with the category of "propaganda" are evinced by the disparate approaches employed by these scholars. For instance, Adamson argues that court ceremony cannot be considered propaganda because the court intended to reach a very specific, elite audience. On the other hand, Shaw argues that control over ceremony is the key issue in determining propaganda, therefore, ceremonies that were not designed explicitly by the court cannot be considered propaganda. I work under a much broader definition of "propaganda" than that apparent in Adamson's work; propaganda conveys a message, it does not matter if it is only intended for a small percentage of the vehicle's actual audience. There are still many who subscribe to the "propagandist idiom" (Shaw); especially, Andrew Brown, "Civic Ritual: Bruges and the Counts of Flanders in the Later Middle Ages," *The English Historical Review* 111:446 (April, 1997); Roy Strong, *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450-1650* (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1984).

<sup>48</sup> Cannadine, 19.

<sup>49</sup> Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Peter Burke, "Popular Culture in Seventeenth Century London," *London Journal* 3 (1977): 143-62; R. Malcolm Smuts, "Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma:



seeks to understand how this relationship (or relationships) changed as physical proximity became unnecessary in the face of expanding press.

This relationship was in a state of flux in the early eighteenth century. A survey of the literature on the last Stuarts and early Hanoverians suggests that after 1688, something changed. According to Bucholz and Brewer, Charles II and his brother, James II sought to recreate the court style of their father, Charles I.<sup>50</sup> Though James II was far less successful than his brother at this endeavor, according to Brewer, both “aspired to recreate the monarchy of their father and even to emulate the lavish embodiment of royal authority epitomized by Louis XIV’s Versailles.”<sup>51</sup> After the openly Catholic James was overthrown in 1688, emulating a Catholic court was no longer a viable goal. This left the court without a firm precedent to follow, as well as with a hefty deficit. As a result, the court was in a difficult situation in that post-1688 monarchs still needed to establish and bolster their authority, but they sought to do so in a way that would distinguish themselves from the extravagance of the absolutist French court; or, as Marilyn Morris puts it, after 1688 the monarchy experienced an “identity crisis”.<sup>52</sup> Some scholars attribute this crisis to the desacralization of the monarchy. It is clear that religion

---

The English Royal Entry in London, 1485-1642,” in *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honor of Lawrence Stone*, eds. A. L. Beier, David Cannadine and James M. Rosenheim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 65-93; Benjamin Klein, “Between the Bums and the Bellies of the Multitude’: Civic Pageantry and the Problem of the Audience in Late Stuart London,” *London Journal* 17:1 (1992): 18-26. Wim Blockmans, *A History of Power in Europe: Peoples, Market and States* (Antwerp and New York, 1997), 267-301; Wim Blockmans and Walter Prevenier, *The Promised Lands: The Low Countries Under Burgundian Rule, 1369-1530*, trans. Elizabeth Fackelman, ed. Edward Peters (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999); Peter J. Arnade, *Realms of Ritual: Burgundian Ceremony and Civic Life in Late Medieval Ghent* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996); James M. Murray, “The Liturgy of the Count’s Advent in Bruges, from Galbert to Van Eyck,” in *City and Spectacle in Medieval Europe*, eds. Barbara Hanawalt and Kathryn L. Reyerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 137-52; David Nicholas, “In the Pit of the Burgundian Theatre State: Urban Traditions and Princely Ambitions in Ghent 1360-1420,” in *City and Spectacle*.

<sup>50</sup> Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, 12-22; Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination*, 8-17.

<sup>51</sup> Brewer, 8.

<sup>52</sup> Morris, 140.

remained intimately connected to the monarch, and politics in general, as Anne and George I were viewed as protectors of the Protestant cause against Catholic threats on the continent.<sup>53</sup> As Morris' book suggests, such an identity appears most clearly when viewed from the outside.

Smith's most recent article argues that Anne was the last monarch to attempt to appeal to the monarch's divine nature.<sup>54</sup> One of the most vivid examples of Anne's attempt to restore traditional ceremonies of divine-right rule is her revival of the ceremony of touching for the King's Evil. Smith speculates that this was partially a response to public expectations, and partially the queen's own desire to revive the traditional Stuart form of monarchy made famous by her uncle, Charles II.

In a recent study, utilizing a methodology similar to my own, Benjamin Klein argues that portrayals of post-Restoration ceremonial in the public sphere were highly partisan. While this is worth examining, Klein's conclusion perpetuates the notion that ceremony, specifically written reports of it, were solely tools of propaganda. Klein's study shows that historians of the "rage of party" should look beyond the confines of political treatises and division lists, but it largely ignores the cultural work performed by these depictions.<sup>55</sup> In his brief chapter on Anne's ceremonies, he follows previous scholars, such as Bucholz, noting that she successfully portrayed herself as the nation's nursing mother, but that her efforts to re-engage the elite failed.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980); Bucholz, *Augustan Court*; McConville, *King's Three Faces*; Smith, *Georgian Monarchy*; Eadem, "'Heavenly Birth'."

<sup>54</sup> Smith, "'Heavenly Birth'."

<sup>55</sup> For the most important work on politics during Anne's reign see: Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London: Macmillan, 1967).

<sup>56</sup> Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, 249.

The case for George is quite different. While many scholars claim that he was distant, uninterested in his English subjects, and unpopular, Smith makes the case that he knew exactly what he was doing and excelled at it. Instead of failing to continue the Stuart tradition of court ceremony, he exhibited “a key characteristic of Enlightened kingship [which] was the desire to overthrow the shackles of royal ceremony and etiquette.”<sup>57</sup> The question remains, however, if this was an “Enlightened” form of royalty, driven by reason rather than ceremony, why is it that George III is often considered to be lauded as the king who revived interest in the monarchy through his use of ritual?<sup>58</sup> My work will show that people did not simply “lose interest” in ritual. This notion is the result of historians operating under the notion that ceremony was at odds with Enlightenment culture and the new privileging of reason.

Changes in royal ceremonial styles have often been equated to changes in royal personality. David Starkey notes an alternating pattern between what he calls “distance” and “accessibility” throughout the Tudor and Stuart lines.<sup>59</sup> Both Anne and George I are generally considered “distant” monarchs, but a view from the public sphere will likely reveal otherwise. Unless we assume that these monarchs were completely out of touch with what was going on in the world or were, themselves, completely at the mercy of their own whims, we must conclude that such shifts were a response, whether intentional or not, to changing circumstances. According to followers of Habermas’ theory, the court sought to create or emphasize the distance between the monarch and his or her subjects as a means to maintain royal dignity and authority, but this became increasingly unrealistic. James Van Horn Melton argues that it was during the

---

<sup>57</sup> Smith, *Georgian Monarchy*, 95.

<sup>58</sup> See especially, McConville and Morris.

<sup>59</sup> Starkey, “Intimacy and Innovation.”

Revolution of 1688-9 that “England’s incipient public sphere was institutionalized.”<sup>60</sup> That is, the opinion of the public, which was formed and given power through the interactions between individuals in the “public sphere”, came to the fore as a real political power. The monarch no longer had only to worry about impressing his or her courtiers, but the public at large. Therefore, appearances and displays at court (which Habermas called “representative publicness”<sup>61</sup>), produced for a select group of people, were no longer enough. The monarchy had a much larger audience to deal with, including, according to Habermas, the new *bourgeoisie*. Both Anne and George had the reason and, through the proliferating press, the means to reach a larger audience.

There are ample studies on the changing nature of the monarchy in the context of the new public sphere, but the ways that emotional rhetoric operated in this sphere has primarily been the province of colonial scholars. Nicole Eustace argues that emotions were at the heart of debates over liberty in pre-Revolutionary America. Her study shows that such illustrious enlightenment thinkers as Thomas Paine and Alexander Pope had very specific theories of emotions; neither saw the passions as inherently opposed to reason. The most important work for my own study is Brendan McConville’s *The King’s Three Faces*. Here McConville examines the ways that royal ritual reached the colonial shores via the press. He concludes that “married as [the colonists] were to royal political spectacle and a slavishly loyal print culture, the result was a polity sewn together by passions rather than patronage in the American provinces.”<sup>62</sup> In each instance, these

---

<sup>60</sup> Melton, *The Rise of the Public*, 20.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>62</sup> McConville, 9.

scholars complicate widely held notions about early America, in part through the study of emotion. My project will show that political passions were not solely the province of colonists.<sup>63</sup>

## II. Methodology

This dissertation examines the ways the monarchy sought to create and maintain a culture of loyalty during periods of transition. Scholars have looked to the court's patronage of the arts and visual programs promoted through painting and sculpture to measure the court's cultural impact.<sup>64</sup> I examine the ways the court used emotions in ceremonies and surrounding rhetoric to maintain relevance in periods of transition. Amidst anxieties about proper Protestant piety and calls for reform, the monarchs in this study promoted themselves as ideals of proper emotional comportment. To understand this affective program, I examine royal ceremonies used to transition or build dynasties and the affective rhetoric surrounding them.

The study of the history of emotions has shown that emotions play different roles in different societies and moments in time. To better understand attitudes to emotions from 1660 to 1760, I examine contemporary normative literature concerning emotional comportment. Though scholars such as Lawrence Stone have suggested that this period became more secular in the eighteenth century, religion maintained a potent influence in English society.

The expansion of print meant that more people had access to the messages disseminated by the court. However, the messages spread through print became increasingly focused on the elite under the Hanoverians. Those who addressed the monarch on the occasion of an accession or marriage were members of ostensibly representative bodies, but they communicated in ways

---

<sup>63</sup> See also, Sarah Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 2008).

<sup>64</sup> To name a few: Bucholz, *Augustan Court*; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*; Idem, *Image Wars*; Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination*.

that bowed to elite mores and expectations. Effectively, this project examines the different methods through which the court and the political elite communicated with each other in the public sphere. According to Bucholz, the aristocracy was "this most important level of Augustan society that Anne's revival of royal ceremony and symbolism failed most dramatically to promote unity and moderation."<sup>65</sup> I argue that the court influenced elite language and the elite used specific language to elicit the crown's favor.

One of the more useful sources for this project is addresses presented by representatives of civic and town governments, professional societies and other corporate bodies to the king or queen. Addresses were presented to show loyalty and gain favor. Knights' study of petitioning and addressing in the early eighteenth century suggests that through these addresses, "the public could...appear multi-vocal, as well as a representative entity." He says that addresses and petitions to the crown enabled a dialogue between representative institutions that eroded "the distinction between 'local' and 'national'."<sup>66</sup> My analysis focuses on the dialogue these addresses presented between sovereign and subject. Addresses were pre-written, and presented at court to the monarch in person. Newspaper accounts of addresses often assert that the address was composed in common council assembled, thus highlighting the representative intent of the address. Representatives of a town or corporation would be introduced to the monarch by the Lord Chamberlain or other high-ranking court official. Once the address was read aloud, the

---

<sup>65</sup> R. O. Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, 225.

<sup>66</sup> Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2005), 110.

addressors might be allowed to kiss the monarch's hand. This process was described in varying levels of detail through the period.<sup>67</sup>

Subjects addressed the king or queen on a variety of occasions, such as military victories or the royal birthday, or even giving thanks for a speech given before Parliament. This project focuses on those addresses presented on the occasions of a monarch's death and accession, and royal weddings.<sup>68</sup> Further, I have focused on addresses published in newspapers.<sup>69</sup> As Knights notes, these addresses "spread into every borough, the growing culture of politeness that historians of the eighteenth century have seen as such a feature of the political landscape."<sup>70</sup> This study focuses on the affective rhetoric used in these addresses to better understand the role of emotion in polite culture. The decision to print these addresses was part of the court's attempts to control political culture and reform the broader public.

The term "public" is a problematic one during this period. There was no monolithic "public" that thought and acted as one. Nevertheless, it was a term frequently used by politicians and the court in the late seventeenth century, and even more so in the eighteenth century. Portrayals of public support surrounded ceremonial occasions to varying degrees. To better understand these variances, I examine the ways in which the court and politicians used public displays, or "acclamations of joy" to promote the image of consensus. Nicolas Mariot calls this the "economy of jubilation", which he defines through the formula "if spectators applaud, it

---

<sup>67</sup> No study had been published detailing who was allowed and who was not allowed, or how frequently such detail was printed from one reign to the next. It would be a useful means to determine who was in and who was out of favor.

<sup>68</sup> Addresses presented to a new monarch on their accession included condolences for the deceased.

<sup>69</sup> Addresses are scattered throughout the archives of England and I have not done a study of what percentage of them were published.

<sup>70</sup> Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 151.

means they support.”<sup>71</sup> Bucholz notes that Anne and members of her government took such expressions as “a virtual mandate for current policy.”<sup>72</sup> Phrases such as “acclamations of joy” were specifically used to evince political support. Though Mariot claims that these expressions of emotion and celebration are the results of social conditioning and, therefore, cannot be taken as sincere, the fact that such crowd reactions were interpreted in emotive terms speaks to the importance of emotions in politics. More importantly, different courts found such displays useful as propaganda to varying degrees.

To avoid a purely top-down analysis, this dissertation examines sermons and treatises on the passions to better understand why monarchs used emotive language more frequently, and more fervently throughout the period. Sermons became a best selling genre in the early modern period, as publishers printed them in ever-greater numbers. Alex Gargino’s study of mourning literature produced for Mary II’s death in 1695 suggests that there was also market for handbooks on how to properly express and understand emotion.<sup>73</sup> Normative texts provided the public with cues to interpreting their social meanings.<sup>74</sup> To understand the uses of affective rhetoric in court propaganda, I look to sermons and other normative literature. These analyses illustrate the ways in which the court sought to influence cultural and political norms.

---

<sup>71</sup> Nicolas Mariot, “Does acclimation equal agreement? Rethinking collective effervescence through the case of the presidential “tour de France” during the twentieth century,” *Theoretical Sociology* 40 (2011): 191-221. Mariot argues that rituals do not create affective bonds or any sense of allegiance but what appears to be emotional involvement is essentially the result of cultural and social conditioning. I am not convinced by this argument. He fails to provide an adequate account of why these rituals continue to hold our attention, as well as to account for expressions of dissent. I nevertheless find his construction of the “economy of jubilation” to be mildly useful.

<sup>72</sup> Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, 210.

<sup>73</sup> Alex Gargino, “William without Mary: Mourning Sensibly in the Public Sphere,” *Seventeenth Century Journal* 23:1 (2008).

<sup>74</sup> Barbara Rosenwein provides a helpful description of fruitful approaches to the study of emotions in history in Eadem, “Thinking Historically about Medieval Emotions,” *History Compass* 8:8 (2010): 828-42.



Conversely, they show the ways in which extra-court culture guided portrayals of the monarch to both elite audiences and the public more broadly.

### III. Chapter Organization

The following analysis is organized thematically. The second chapter examines changing theories of, and attitudes to the emotions. Focusing primarily on the second half of the seventeenth century, this chapter shows that emotions came to be seen as useful, rather than dangerous to proper piety. Chapter two thus lays the foundation for the rest of the dissertation, by detailing the larger cultural trends the court both reacted to and sought to influence. Each successive chapter also examines interpretations of emotions in sermons and advice literature surrounding a specific ceremonial occasion.

Chapters three, four and five each examine a different ceremony. A royal death was the end of one reign and, with the exception of 1688/9, the beginning of a new one, and royal funerals are the focus of chapter three. Throughout the period the form of funerals changed to suit changing ideas of monarchy. This chapter also introduces the dialogue between sovereign and subject which became a more prominent part of ceremonial occasions as addresses were published with greater frequency and detail. Chapter three thus shows that, as royal funerals became more private, this dialogue became more public. Both monarch and subjects increasingly expressed their grief throughout the period.

Chapters four and five turn to happier subjects, addressing accessions and coronations, and royal weddings. Coronations changed little throughout the period, as the stability of the ceremony was necessary to maintain the illusion of consistency from one reign to the next. However, despite the static form of ceremonial, commemoration of the monarch's accession became more open and more emotive. In contrast, royal weddings changed, becoming more

public affairs under the Hanoverians. Though the guest lists were restricted to the elite, details of royal weddings were published to ensure continued dynastic authority. Members of the royal family were celebrated as models of conjugal happiness, and royal brides were promoted as ideals of obedient feminine virtue. Simultaneously, royal marriages themselves were promoted as evidence of the king's "paternal affection" for his people, reminding his subjects of their obligation to him as *pater familias* of the nation.

Together, these chapters survey the ways in which the court used emotion to encourage loyalty to the monarchy. Amidst increasing cultural emphasis on reason and growing power among representative institutions, monarchs moved beyond the walls of the court, laying open their own emotions to elicit those of their people.

## CHAPTER TWO

### "SPRINGS OF EACH VIRTUOUS ACTION": PASSIONS AND PIETY IN EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

In the later part of the seventeenth century, Anglican clergyman William Clagett noted in a sermon that it was "a very odd notion of the Passions of our Nature in the general, that they are evil in themselves: that is far from being true."<sup>1</sup> This sermon was published posthumously by Clagett's brother in 1720 with no indication of where, when or if it was ever given. William Clagett, the son of Nicholas Clagett, a minister at St. Mary's, who was expelled for his puritan sympathies in 1661, was educated at Emmanuel college, Cambridge.<sup>2</sup> Despite his family's puritan connections, he was named Chaplain to King Charles II in 1677. Clagett's argument about the passions illustrates the shift in Anglican (and nonconformist) attitudes to the passions that began in the last decades of the seventeenth century. Clagett's puritan upbringing exposed him to the negative view of human nature inherent in puritan theology (and High-Church Anglicanism) that saw the passions as evidence of sin and attachment to earthly existence. This theology that saw humans as vehicles of sin, unable to achieve virtue without guidance from God (or the Church) dominated Protestant religious thought in England prior to the Revolution of 1688/9. It was not until after 1688 (also the year of Clagett's death) that the notion that humans were capable of achieving virtue through thinking and acting properly became popular at the

---

<sup>1</sup> Clagett. *Sermons on the following subjects...* (London, 1720), 474.

<sup>2</sup> The term puritan is problematic. I use it here to refer to followers of Calvinist predestinarianism that dominated England in the 1650s.

pulpit. In the years following the Revolution of 1688, this increasingly practical current in Anglican theology came to embrace the passions, especially love, as the key to proper piety and virtue.

This shift was not clear cut or restricted to attitudes to the passions. As Brent Sirota has recently shown, during this period, the Anglican Church shifted its focus, however unintentionally, away from salvific goals and institutional loyalty to embrace a language and theology that highlighted the public good. Sirota argues these changing attitudes to virtue led to what he terms the "age of benevolence," by the mid-eighteenth century. This chapter highlights a parallel and related shift whose origins were not restricted to institutional boundaries.

One of the earliest proponents of this new approach to piety was a small group of Cambridge divines in the mid-seventeenth century. Though products of puritan culture, these Cambridge Platonists were influenced by enlightenment thinkers and started conversations about the role of human nature in the pursuit of virtue that challenged both Church authority and puritan enthusiasm. Their ideas directly influenced key participants in the Revolution of 1688, which resulted in new calls for toleration and court-backed initiatives to unite the Protestant community. Their "practical" approach to religiosity saw the emotions as tools rather than evils, and became an important element in the English Enlightenment.

Toleration was at the heart of the Cambridge Platonists' philosophies. They saw the creation of a pious and harmonious Protestant community as the key to national and individual peace. After 1688, the crown increasingly supported those who promoted this message through patronage and by presenting the monarch as an exemplar of practical (and practicable) piety. As will be made clear throughout the rest of the project, these new ideas about the nation as a Protestant community were also used in calls to loyalty.

The purpose of this chapter is thus multifarious. At its most basic level, it provides a glimpse of the culture in which the court operated and to which it reacted. Because the rest of this project will illustrate the ways these shifting attitudes to the emotions became integral in the constant re-negotiation between monarchs and their subjects, this chapter first attempts a brief overview of the intellectual trends that affected popular attitudes to the emotions (or passions). One important source of these changing attitudes may be found in a group of divines connected through Cambridge University in the mid-seventeenth century. The ideas of these so-called Cambridge Platonists proved influential to later theologians, philosophers, and politicians. The main focus of this chapter follows with a general survey of changing trends in sermons from the period of roughly 1685 to 1760. Though by no means exhaustive, this cross-section will show a broad shift in theological approaches to the passions. Throughout the period, religious leaders became more concerned with individual behavior and personal piety in the maintenance of the godly community. I seek to show that this shift was due, in part, to the inspiration of the Cambridge Platonists, but was also supported and, to some extent, driven by the court. One outlet through which the court exercised its influence was the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, which sought to create a more pious Protestant society. These Societies were both the result of and proponents for these new attitudes. Consisting of "mostly low-church anglicans, presbyterians, and Independents,"<sup>3</sup> they promoted emotions, especially love, as necessary to creating a pious and successful nation. This chapter thus explores the ways in which the passions shifted from the source of sin and vice to the source of humanity's ability to do good.

---

<sup>3</sup> Karen Sonnelitter, "The Reformation of Manners Societies, the Monarchy, and the English State, 1696-1714," *The Historian* 72:3 (Fall, 2010): 518.

### I. Enlightened Passions: Interpretations of Augustan Philosophies

The study of the history of emotions was for many years entwined with the search for the birth of modernity. Scholars such as Lawrence Stone looked to the early modern period to understand the development of modern attitudes and mentalities. Norbert Elias, argued that refined emotions became the province of the elite as they learned to control themselves, paving the way for modern manners.<sup>4</sup> Elias' work, though initially published in German in 1939, was only widely accepted with great accolades in the English-speaking community in the late 1980s. It has since provided the straw man for many historians of emotions. Barbara Rosenwein cites Elias regularly as an example of what historians of medieval emotions seek to contradict, arguing that medieval constructions of emotions were just as complex and restrictive as their early modern successors. Early modern scholar Fay Bound Alberti also takes umbrage at Elias' narrative of the "emergence of 'modern' emotional behavior as a history of affective restraint versus indulgence."<sup>5</sup> As the following discussions will show, English attitudes to the emotions (or passions) in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries exhibit a trajectory in nearly direct opposition to Elias'.

These attitudes were intimately connected to notions of the body and its place in the universe. Debates on the relationship between bodies in the heavens, political theory, man's relationship to God, proper morality, and the workings of the human body were linked in ways both overt and subtle, so a breakthrough in one topic often led to shifts in understanding in others. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 'passion' generally - but not

---

<sup>4</sup> Norbert Elias, *The Court Society*, translated by Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983).

<sup>5</sup> Alberti, "Emotions in the Early Modern Medical Tradition," 1.

exclusively - indicated violent or intense emotion,<sup>6</sup> but the number of dangerous passions to be suppressed or mitigated decreased during the period. The puritan-dominated thought of the mid-seventeenth century held that the passions were the result of sin and to be treated with contempt. But by the 1720s, it became common for moralists to urge the use of the passions to motivate the individual to proper piety and civility. This shift was complex and often happened in very subtle ways, which may account for scholars' focus on the later part of the eighteenth century, when the rise of the novel brought emotions and civility to the forefront.

This complex development has created different avenues for modern scholarship that often do not intersect with one another. The philosophical embrace of the passions has earned different labels among different scholarly communities. Literary scholars look to it for the origins of the culture of sensibility, which reached its climax in the novels of Jane Austen and Mary Wollstonecraft. Philosophers have recently looked to this period as the watershed of the "Moral Self-Governance View," or "Sentimentalism";<sup>7</sup> while historians discuss the growth of civility and politeness, or more recently, the history of emotions.<sup>8</sup> Sentimentalism stemmed from theological and philosophical debates about human capacity for virtue and the place of reason in faith; sensibility originated in changing ideas about the relationship between the mind and the

---

<sup>6</sup> For the sake of clarity, I will use the term 'emotion' in the modern sense to appeal to modern categorization.

<sup>7</sup> Unlike literary scholars, philosophers cannot seem to agree on a name. See especially, Michael B. Gill, "From Cambridge Platonism to Scottish Sentimentalism," *Journal of Scottish Philosophy* 8:1 (2010), 13-31; Joseph Duke Filonowicz, *Fellow-Feeling and the Moral Life* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008); and Monique Canto-Sperber, ed., *La philosophie morale britannique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994).

<sup>8</sup> The list is quite long. See especially, J. G. A. Pocock, "Virtues, Rights, and Manners: A Model for Historians of Political Thought," *Political Theory* 9:3 (1981), 353-68; Marvin B. Becker, *The Emergence of Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century: A Privileged Moment in the History of England, Scotland, and France* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994); Andrew Lincoln, "War and the Culture of Politeness: The Case of *The Tatler* and *The Spectator*," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 36:2 (Spring 2012): 60-79; Lawrence Klein, introduction to Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of Shaftesbury, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Idem, "Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century," *The Historical Journal* 45:4 (Dec. 2004).

body; and the study of politeness is especially focused on behavior in political circles. These movements were not completely separate; in fact, early Enlightenment thinkers often played many roles, including natural philosopher, mathematician, theologian, and medical theorist.<sup>9</sup> These labels are simply the attempts of modern scholars to make sense of the milieu of the early Enlightenment in which country physicians engaged in debate with Oxford scholars and royal chaplains in ordinary took on elite natural philosophers with accusations of atheism or deism. This period saw what many scholars describe as the birth of modernity - modern attitudes towards individual rights and consumer-driven behavior. In their search for the origins of modernity, some scholars have lost sight of the conservatism of the period. I argue that this is one reason that important trends in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries have been overlooked.

Among literature scholars, the growth of acceptable passions or affections is known as the rise of sensibility. Sensibility is defined by its most thorough historian, G. J. Barker-Benfield, as "a widespread expression of the more refined kind of suffering," which increasingly separated the middle classes from the real, human suffering of the poor.<sup>10</sup> Thus, sensibility was a direct outgrowth of the commercial and financial revolutions and the rise of the middling sort. It was a trend that embraced new expressions of emotion, especially in forms that exhibited shared or sympathetic feelings for the plight of fellow men, driven by the cultural and political power of the middling sorts. This culture of sensibility received full expression in the mid- to late-eighteenth century in novels such as Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* (often cited as *the* first

---

<sup>9</sup> Michael Heyd valiantly attempts to treat the medical and theological threads simultaneously, though even this very enlightening work repeatedly admits that the topic is too extensive to treat in detail: Idem, *"Be Sober and Reasonable": The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

<sup>10</sup> G. J. Barker-Benfield, 'Sensibility,' in *An Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age: British Culture 1776-1832*, ed. Iain McCalman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 102.



sentimental novel, published in 1748) and *The Man of Feeling*, by Henry McKenzie (1777).

According to Barker-Benfield, sensibility came to be a defining factor of the female sphere, especially the "public leisure culture ["bourgeois"] women had not enjoyed before."<sup>11</sup> The novel became a more desirable consumer product in this sphere in the later eighteenth century. For this reason, most studies of 'sensibility' focus on the literary movement and only examine the years surrounding the Glorious Revolution with an eye to explaining the flourishing of the novel and sensibility at the mid-century.

One exception is Lawrence Stone's seminal work on changing habits and norms in family creation. Stone sees a significant shift towards what he deems "affective individualism" starting in 1660, which led to more companionate marriages by the mid-century. Looking at a wide range of sources, Stone argues that as English culture became more accepting of and interested in individual identity, it became more accepting of individual feelings. Stone sees this as partially growing out of the focus on "religious introspection arising from the Calvinist sense of guilt and anxiety about salvation."<sup>12</sup>

Others have looked to elite political circles for the origins of this literary movement. Julie Elliston argues that early sensibility had its origin in the creation of the Whig party and the necessity to create male bonds and behaviors that would elevate them above the conservative Tories. Though the whig Earl of Shaftesbury brought more attention to the place of passions or emotions in the social and political spheres with his *Letter on Enthusiasm* (1707) and *Characteristics* (1711), he was not its creator. In fact, Ellison's work fails to look at the major outcry against Shaftesbury's works from the sphere which had been thinking and debating

---

<sup>11</sup> Barker-Benfield (1992), xxvi.

<sup>12</sup> Lawrence Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (London: Penguin Books, 1977; reprint, 1990), 153.

emotional comportment for decades: the theologians.<sup>13</sup> Few scholars of sensibility have yet looked to its the theological origins to gain a better understanding of popular attitudes to the passions. Barker-Benfield claims that it was the "heart religion" that came to the fore with the creation of Methodism in the 1740s. I argue that the debates that led to Wesley's theology had been prominent in religious circles for at least fifty years prior. No single person or movement was the sole originator of the culture of sensibility. Rather, it was a combination of factors that created a culture that embraced the cultivation and use of the passions for individual and communal good. Before this could be acceptable, however, the passions themselves had to become less dangerous. This started in the mid-seventeenth century with enlightened theories of the human body.

## II. Passions and the Body in the Mid-Seventeenth Century

Most scholars who have sought to understand the origins of modern thought, have looked to great philosophers like René Descartes or John Locke for answers. Barker-Benfield and other scholars of sensibility argue that it originated in changing conceptions of the body. For Barker-Benfield, sensibility grew out of the eighteenth-century theory that the upper classes had more refined nerve fibers, which made them more sensitive (or sensible) to emotions. These theories descended from changing perceptions of the body in the seventeenth century, when new ideas of the mind-body-soul relationship began to challenge the humoral theory that had been the basis of understanding of the human body for centuries.

The predominant medical theory in the seventeenth century was based on the work of the second-century Greek philosopher Galen Pergamum. According to this theory, the body was made up of humors - blood, yellow bile, phlegm, and black bile -that corresponded to certain

---

<sup>13</sup> Julie Ellison, *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

elements and their associated qualities. Blood corresponded to air, which was hot and moist; yellow bile (or anger) equalled the hot and dry qualities of fire; phlegm was like water, cold and moist; and black bile (or melancholy) corresponded to earth, which was hot and dry.<sup>14</sup> Each individual was pre-disposed to a predominance of one humor based on their age, sex, and certain environmental or habitual factors. The humors could be balanced through external factors, such as diet or exercise, but an imbalance of these humors had emotional, behavioral, and physical effects. Emotions were the direct result of physical forces within the body; and thus, the individual had relatively little control over the type and degree of emotions they experienced.

In the mid-seventeenth century, mechanistic theories about the body began to gain attention. Descartes' *Les Passiones de l'Ame* (translated into English in 1650) separated the soul from the body and made the pineal gland the mediator between the two. The two still worked together, but Descartes presented the passions as sort of conductors of the body. According to Descartes, passions were aroused by external stimuli, and "the main effect of every passion is to arouse the soul and make it will the body to move in the way the passion prepares the body for."<sup>15</sup> Passions affect the body, but can be controlled by the mind. They can also be good or bad, depending on their intensity and object. Descartes' theory was diametrically opposed to the humoral theory, which believed all passions had negative effects on health, because they upset the balance of the body. Descartes argued that the passions "are all intrinsically good, and that all we have to avoid is their misuse or their excess." The way to mitigate the passions was to "bear in mind that everything presented to the imagination [the first step in exciting a passion] tends to mislead the soul and make the reasons for pursuing the object of its passion appear much

---

<sup>14</sup> Bound Alberti, 3.

<sup>15</sup> René Descartes, *The Passions of the Soul*, trans. John Bennet (accessed at <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/pdfs/descartes1649.pdf>), 12.

stronger than they are, and the reasons for pursuing it much weaker."<sup>16</sup> The passions had the potential to negatively affect the body and the soul, but could be consciously controlled through individual awareness and rational thought. This put the individual in control over their own emotions. To avoid excessive or misleading emotions, one must reflect on one's own motivations and use his or her rational faculties to mitigate excessive or improperly-focused passions.

Descartes' *Passions of the Soul* was not alone in its assertion that the passions could be used for either good or ill depending on the will and efforts of the individual. The French physician (and later physician in ordinary to Louis XIV) Marin Cureau de la Chambre wrote a similar treatise, *The character of the passions*, translated and published in English initially in 1650. According to La Chambre, the passions were appetitive, but not all appetites should be called "passions."

I suppose...the Passions are motions of the Appetite, by which the Soul seeks to draw neer Good, and to shun Ill; and that there are two Appetites in Man, The Sensitive, and the Intellectual, which is the Will. All the actions of the Sensitive Appetite are called Passions, forasmuch as the Minde is agitated by them, and the body suffers and sensibly changeth in its motions. But all the actions of the Will, although they are Motions, bear not the name of Passions: For there are two kindes of them; some, which are not for him who acts, but for another; as all actions are, whether just or unjust. Others, which are onely for him who acts them; as Love, Hate, Pride, and other Motions of the Will. The first are simply called Actions, or Operations; the other are called Passions, by reason of the likeness they have with the motions of the Appetite.<sup>17</sup>

Like Descartes, La Chambre broke the passions down into categories, but some passions were not so easily categorized and therefore were "Mixt Passions".<sup>18</sup> Though there are some

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 58. Christopher Tilmouth, "Generosity and the Utility of the Passions: Cartesian Ethics in Restoration England," *The Seventeenth Century* 22:1 (2007): 144-167.

<sup>17</sup> Marin Cureau de la Chambre, *The characters of the passions* (London, 1650), unpaginated, ff. 8r-v. In a later translation of this work, "Sensitive" and "Intellectual" are referred to as "Corporeal" and "Moral": Marin de la Chambre, *A discourse on the passions* (London, 1661), 3.

<sup>18</sup> La Chambre, 1650, ff. 9r.

deviations between the two schemes, they share an insistence that passions are necessary to, and evidence of virtue, because they require individual effort to control them.

Reception of these texts is impossible to gauge, but the fact that they were first published in England within a year of one another, and were each produced in later editions suggests there was a demand for them. It is unlikely that they would have appealed to popular audiences.<sup>19</sup>

There is, however, evidence to suggest that the theory that passions could be controlled and used for moral good was highly influential to divines and moralists who sought to negate the negative view of human nature perpetuated by the humoral theory of the body, and the predominant contemporary predestinarian theology. Descartes' philosophies in particular became an important tool, when used selectively, in the arsenal of theologians who set out to denounce the negative views of humanity inherent in Calvinist predestinarianism, and argue that virtue could be achieved through reason. In fact, Descartes corresponded with a group of Cambridge theologians who laid the foundations for the wider acceptance of the passions in the late seventeenth century.<sup>20</sup>

### I. Peace through Passion: the Cambridge Platonists

In the mid-seventeenth century, a small group of Cambridge divines - whom historians have deemed the Cambridge Platonists - dedicated themselves to promoting Enlightenment ideals such as reason and toleration in the Church. They were all associated with Cambridge

---

<sup>19</sup> La Chambre's text was published in 1649, 1650, 1661, and 1693. Descartes' *Passions of the Soule* was published in 1650.

<sup>20</sup> This is not to say that all of the Cambridge Platonists discussed below agreed with Descartes. Henry More seems to have retained at least some elements of the humoral theory in his philosophies. See Michael Heyd, *"Be Sober and Reasonable": The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (New York, NY: E.J. Brill, 1995), 92-108.

University, especially with Emmanuel and Christ's colleges, in the 1630s through the 1680s. Those most often associated with the Cambridge Platonists include Henry More (1614-1687), Benjamin Whichcote (1609-1683), Ralph Cudworth (1617-1688), John Smith (1614-1652), Peter Sterry (d. 1672), and Nathaniel Culverwell (1618-1651), though John C. English added Simon Patrick, Bishop of Ely and Edward Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester to their number as associates who were "less significant from a theological point of view."<sup>21</sup> Most were educated at the decidedly-puritan Emmanuel College, and most came from Calvinist families.<sup>22</sup> Despite this, they reacted in many ways against the puritanism of the institutions that nurtured them. They saw the aspects of puritan theology that emphasized the sinful nature of humanity as hindrances to peace and unity within the Church and society more broadly. Historians have disagreed about their political leanings and the extent of their engagement with Cromwell's political mission. They were not openly political. Instead, they focused on promoting toleration of all Protestants through an emphasis on individual reason. Though many of them faded into relative obscurity, through their philosophies, they guided and inspired the next generation of revolutionary thinkers who helped to bring William III and Mary II to the throne in 1688, and thereafter change the character of English Christianity.

The Cambridge Platonists are to some extent enigmatic figures in that they were "nurtured in Emmanuel College, the stronghold of the Puritan tradition," and yet laid the foundations for late-century latitudinarian theology which was "in some measure in revolt from [Puritanism]."<sup>23</sup> Recently, Sarah Hutton has called for a reassessment of the Cambridge

---

<sup>21</sup> John C. English, "The Cambridge Platonists in Wesley's 'Christian Library'," *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* (October 1968), 161.

<sup>22</sup> F.J. Powicke, *The Cambridge Platonists: A Study* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926).

<sup>23</sup> Rev. W. Telfer, "University Sermon: The Cambridge Platonists," *The Cambridge Review* 68 (1947): 292.

Platonists, arguing that they should be counted among the radicals of the English Revolution. She argues they should be classified as "radicals" because they all received appointments at Cambridge after the purge of 1644, in which the Earl of Manchester ejected fellows suspected of royalist sympathies, along with their service to Cromwell during the Commonwealth and Protectorate. Their careers certainly benefitted from the Parliamentary victory - Cudworth and Whichcote served as advisors to Cromwell, Sterry became his chaplain in ordinary in 1649.<sup>24</sup> With the exception of Sterry, however, all that is known about their specific connections to Cromwell may be seen as part of their dedication to toleration - Whichcote and Cudworth advised Cromwell in his policy to re-admit the Jews to England in 1655.<sup>25</sup> Hutton's claim that their careers died after the Restoration is based on a "silence" that she detects in the post-Restoration fortunes of these Cambridge men, but it neglects important aspects of their later careers, notably, Whichcote's appointment to the parish of St. Lawrence Jury in 1668.<sup>26</sup> Her argument also fails to account for the publication of their works in the years after the Restoration. They never outwardly allied themselves with the Parliamentary cause, even if they benefitted from it. They were treated with some suspicion by the Royalist regime after the Restoration, which was apt, because their philosophies influenced many of the men who effected the fall of James II in 1688. Even if they were not themselves political radicals, they were at least partially responsible for nurturing the next generation of political radicals. They also inspired the

---

<sup>24</sup> Powicke, 113, 177.

<sup>25</sup> Sarah Hutton, "A Radical Review of the Cambridge Platonists," *Varieties of Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context*, eds. Ariel Hessayon and David Finnegan (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 171; Powicke, 113.

<sup>26</sup> Hutton, 165.

latitudinarian theology that embraced toleration, peace, and reason that put them in the court's good graces after 1688.<sup>27</sup>

Hutton's other criterion of radicalism is "novelty in philosophical thinking and heterodoxy in theology," which the Cambridge Platonists certainly met.<sup>28</sup> They were "opponents of the stern Calvinism which dominated academic Puritanism" in the 1640s and 1650s.<sup>29</sup> They sought a *via media* between Laudianism and Puritanism that they hoped would ultimately lead to peace and toleration. Following Plato, they insisted that human reason was the path to virtue, it was God-given and therefore did not require divine revelation. Reason, not authority, led to discernment of the good, and of God. They emphasized "the importance of the truth which each man grasps for himself and then uses as the foundation of good conduct."<sup>30</sup> They offered a counter to the Laudian emphasis on Church authority, the Calvinist reliance on revelation, and the Hobbesian insistence on the iniquitous character of human nature. By arguing that each person had the innate capacity for reason, and thus for discerning good from evil, they implied that the reason of dissenting groups should not be immediately discounted. In essence, they argued for toleration. More importantly for the purpose of this chapter, their philosophies gave moral agency to individual feeling.

According to the predominant Puritan thought at the time, humans were inherently immoral and bound for damnation without the divine grace offered through revelation. In the absence of any such revelation or to make oneself worthy of grace, the goal was to suppress the

---

<sup>27</sup> Melinda Zook, "A Latitudinarian Queen: Mary II and her Churchmen," *Religion and Women in Britain, c. 1660-1760*, ed. Sarah Apetrei and Hannah Smith (Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2014), 99-115.

<sup>28</sup> Hutton, 182.

<sup>29</sup> Hutton, 163.

<sup>30</sup> G. R. Cragg, *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason: A Study of Changes in Religious Thought within the Church of England 1660 to 1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950), 59.



characteristics that made one human. In order to become worthy of grace, lust and anger were to be suppressed, as were love of family and grief over a dead friend. These passions showed weakness and a temporal focus that distracted from focus on God.<sup>31</sup> The Cambridge Platonists combated this view with an emphasis on the individual as an agent of virtue - it could be achieved through individual effort. Determining good from bad was the province of reason, but it also involved internal feeling, or emotion. Henry More called this "*internal sense*" the "Boniform Faculty of the Soul". This "Boniform Faculty" was "the most divine thing within us," and provided the key to "Divine Life", which was not just a matter of reason, but was to be found "principally to consist in Love, Benignity, and in Beneficence or Well-Doing."<sup>32</sup> Passions such as love were not inherently bad, rather, they were necessary in the pursuit of proper morality. The answer to both Laudianism and Puritanism was to deny the supremacy of both High-Church authority and divine revelation, and instead rely on one's god-given reason and internal sense to discover truth and morality. This theology was used and spread most effectively by their students, who included key actors in the Revolution of 1688.

The Cambridge Platonists significantly influenced some of the most important thinkers and Churchmen of the Restoration and post-Revolution period, such as Locke, Tillotson, and Shaftesbury.<sup>33</sup> This influence was effected through their publications and personal connections.

---

<sup>31</sup> This summation is, admittedly, somewhat reductive, as recent work has shown. However, despite the vast variations in Puritan theologies and treatment of human emotion, those most valued among puritans in seventeenth-century England were emotions focused on God and the promise of heavenly afterlife. For the most recent treatment of this problem, see: A. Ryrie and Tom Schwanda, eds. *Puritanism and Emotion in the Early Modern World* (Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016).

<sup>32</sup> Henry More, *Enchiridion Ethicum, The English Translation of 1690* (New York: The Facsimile Text Society, 1930), 16-18 Originally published in 1668 as *Enchiridion ethicum praecipua moralis philosophiae rudimenta complectens*.... This work is also discussed in Gill, 28.

<sup>33</sup> Michael B. Gill, "From Cambridge Platonism to Scottish Sentimentalism," *Journal of Scottish Philosophy* 8:1 (2010), 13-31; Mark Goldie, "Cambridge Platonists (act. 1630s–1680s)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/theme/94274>, accessed 29 Jan 2015]); Barker-Benfield, 6.

Though some of their letters exist, it is impossible to trace all of their social connections. Tracing their careers is the best way to understand their impact on later thought.<sup>34</sup>

Benjamin Whichcote was the oldest of the group, and likely shaped the direction of the shared philosophies of his students and colleagues. Whichcote was less prolific than his colleagues, dedicating his life to teaching instead of writing - most of his writings that have come down to us were published after his death in 1683. His career thus provides an important example of the ways this group impacted the succeeding generations. Whichcote achieved his M.A. at Emmanuel College in 1633 and was elected a fellow that year. He later gained success as a preacher, being appointed to posts at Trinity Church (1636/7) and St. Lawrence Jewry (1668). He was also Provost of King's College, a position which, according to one biographer, "he neither sought, nor was eager to take," primarily because "he could not bring himself to sign the [National] Covenant."<sup>35</sup> He was ejected from this position by Charles II at the Restoration, but there were legal reasons for this. First, he had been elected to the position at King's by the Westminster Assembly (and therefore, not by the king). Second, he had not been a fellow of King's College prior to obtaining the position.<sup>36</sup> Nor does it seem that his ejection from the position at King's College discredited him; as one contemporary noted, "though removed, he was not disgraced or frowned upon."<sup>37</sup> He then retired to a country parish for a few years before

---

<sup>34</sup> For more detailed biographies on each member of this group, see Powicke (1926), and G.P.H. Pawson, *The Cambridge Platonists and their Place in Religious Thought: Hulsean Prize Essay Cambridge University 1926* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1930).

<sup>35</sup> Powicke, 52.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 53, nt. 1.

<sup>37</sup> Cowie, 61. Cowie only refers to this person as a "contemporary".

being appointed as Rector of St. Lawrence Jewry. It was from this position that he "was able to exercise a considerable influence on the religious thought of the time."<sup>38</sup>

He was first and foremost a preacher and influenced some of the most influential preachers of the later seventeenth century. According to F.J. Powicke, he "seems to have introduced a new style" of preaching.<sup>39</sup> His sermons were more accessible, tending towards colloquial appeals to "topics of living interest", rather than "carefully-elaborated discourse."<sup>40</sup> He seems to have had a significant influence on John Tillotson who became Tuesday lecturer at St. Lawrence Jewry in 1663, and later delivered Whichcote's funeral sermon. Tillotson offers one example of the impact the Cambridge Platonists had on English religion and politics. Tillotson has been credited with popularizing a "modern" style of English sermon, free from the cumbersome Latin and Greek quotes favored by previous generations. Tillotson's was a "plain and edifying style in preaching, emphasizing the appeal to reason and to common sense."<sup>41</sup> J.H. Plumb credited one of Tillotson's sermons as being "the most popular sermon in the eighteenth century," and collections of his letters were published at least as late as 1755.<sup>42</sup> Tillotson also shared Whichcote's belief in the toleration of all Protestants, a belief which was at least partially responsible for his elevation to the Archbishopric of Canterbury by Mary II in 1691.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Cowie, 61.

<sup>39</sup> Powicke, 51.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 52.

<sup>41</sup> Cowie, 67. Cites Charles Smyth's *The Art of Preaching in the Church of England 747-1939* - also cites Plumb (Tillotson's influence on the Hanoverian Church).

<sup>42</sup> J. H. Plumb, *England in the Eighteenth Century (1714-1815)* (Baltimore, MD: Pelican Books, 1950), 44. According to Plumb, Tillotson's sermon on 1 John 5:3 (*And his commandments are not grievous*), published in at least one collection in 1714: *The Works of the most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson late Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1714), 70-79. For an example of published letters see: John Tillotson, *Dr. Tillotson's Letter to Mr. Nicolas Hunt of Canterbury* 4th ed. (London, 1755).

<sup>43</sup> Zook (2014).

Tillotson is not the most illustrious figure who had direct connections to this group of Cambridge philosophers. Whichcote's influence can also be traced to Gilbert Burnet who worked closely with Tillotson. Whichcote was also apparently a great influence on the Third Earl of Shaftesbury, who authored the preface to a published edition of some of Whichcote's sermons in 1698. Similarly, Henry More shared mutual friends with John Locke. Edward Fowler, who wrote in favor of the Revolution of 1688 and was appointed Bishop of Gloucester by Mary II, was a friend of More. In fact, More supposedly gave up his position as prebendary specifically so that Fowler could take it over in 1675.<sup>44</sup> As will be noted later, Fowler was also associated with the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, a movement that actively sought to implement some of the philosophies of the Cambridge Platonists in the late seventeenth century. Beyond these specific connections, Whichcote, Smith, Cudworth, and More were all "noted as excellent and popular tutors," so their influence certainly reached well beyond these noted figures.<sup>45</sup> Their philosophies may be detected in sermons starting in the 1660s, but, in large part because of royal support, became much more pronounced in the preaching of the 1690s and early 1700s.

#### IV. Seeds of Goodness and Vice: The Passions in Theology

Very few of the Cambridge Platonists lived to see their ideas regularly and outwardly discussed in mainstream religious culture. It was their students, friends, and colleagues who embraced arguments for the utility of the passions, making them a more common part of Anglican preaching. To do this, however, they required a dynastic shift, effected in part by many friends and students of the Cambridge Platonists, such as John Tillotson and Edward Fowler.

---

<sup>44</sup> Powicke, 151.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 197.

After the Revolution of 1688, more and more clergymen appointed to the position of Chaplain in ordinary urged their flocks to look at passions (or emotions) as tools for good, not evil. Mary II was at least partially responsible for this, as she chose churchmen who sympathized with her desire for toleration. Melinda Zook has recently argued that Mary favored toleration because of her experiences in the United Provinces, where she was exposed not only to different Protestant sects, but also the reality of a tolerant Protestant state.<sup>46</sup> It was thus under Mary's guidance that the Anglican Church became more accepting of nonconformists.<sup>47</sup>

This was not the beginning of the Stuart court's relationship to the philosophies of the Cambridge Platonists. At least one sympathizer of this philosophy was appointed to court positions during the Restoration - William Clagett. But it was in the last decade of the seventeenth century that the character of the Anglican Church started to shift from hard line, high-Church approaches to religiosity that prioritized conformity, to a more "practical" approach that emphasized the importance of living well in everyday life. Essentially, their focus moved from heaven to the earth. This became mainstream in the years following 1688 and took on new life under the Hanoverians, as clergymen embraced the power of temporal emotions.

It was most common for Restoration clergymen to view the passions with suspicion. Passion could include anything from gambling to grieving the loss of a loved one. The one thing all categories of passion had in common was that they all resulted from an attachment to earthly delights. This was the source of their danger to the pious soul. John Cave, Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham offers a clear and succinct example of this view. In 1685, he gave a funeral sermon called *Christian Tranquility, or The government of the passions of joy and grief*, in which he

---

<sup>46</sup> Zook (2014).

<sup>47</sup> I hesitate to use the word "Latitudinarianism" here, as it is a problematic category - as are most in this period. For a recent critique, see: Sirota, 20.

urged the mourners to "number [their] days, and moderate [their] affections in all temporal concernments: That [their] desires may not be *long* when [their] *time* [was] *short*: That all [their] delights and sorrows may bear an equal proportion to their respective Objects."<sup>48</sup> While he warned against a "Stoical Apathy", he explained that one should experience passions for objects that were worthy. Because the physical world was fleeting but the afterlife was eternal, earthly concerns were less-deserving of grief or joy. In essence, one should not grieve or rejoice over matters in one's own life, but focus on the promise of heaven. He even urged his readers to "be moderate in [their] Enjoyments, and [their] Sufferings; not to murmur or repine at [their] *losses*, not to set [their] hearts too much upon [their] remaining *Comforts, Wife, Children, Houses, Lands, &c.* Because how dear and delightsome soever they are to you, they are at best but Treasures in earthen Vessels, subject to a thousand Casualties."<sup>49</sup> Earthly relationships were temporary, and thus, less important than one's relationship to God. To grieve over earthly matters, such as the loss of a loved one, would require taking God's gifts for granted and "provoke him to add to our present *Afflictions*, the removal of remaining *Mercies*."<sup>50</sup> Aside from a suggestion that pious Christians should not judge others for their own passions, Cave focused on the individual's relationship to God. Other clergymen who held similar beliefs in the danger of the passions saw them as equally dangerous to individual and community.

Though Cave represents the typical approach to Restoration Anglican emotional comportment, some of his contemporaries reacted against these inherently negative views by offering approaches to the passions that accepted their inevitability, and promoted the idea of

---

<sup>48</sup> John Cave, *Christian Tranquility, or, The government of the passions of joy and grief*. (London, 1685), 2.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>50</sup> Cave, *Christian Tranquility*, 25.

their utility. Importantly, some of these voices, who echoed the Cambridge Platonists, gained their audience through court patronage. For instance, William Clagett, educated at Emanuel College Cambridge and appointed Chaplain in ordinary to Charles II in 1677, argued that passions were not only a necessary part of human existence, but were a gift from God. In his sermon on sincerity, he noted that it was "a very odd notion of the Passions of our Nature in the general, that they are evil in themselves: that is far from being true."<sup>51</sup> Like most of Clagett's sermons, this was published posthumously in 1720 as part of a larger collection put together by his brother, Nicholas Clagett. As Nicholas did not provide specific information on each sermon, it is impossible to know when or where this was preached. What is certain, however, is that it was given sometime before William's death in 1688. The delay in publishing date could be the result of resistance to the sermon's publication in the 1680s, authorial indifference, or an increased desire for such instruction in the 1720s. Neither Clagett left an explanation. It is also possible that the sermon was written and never given. But this was not the only instance in which Clagett preached (or wrote) in defense of the passions.

In November 1686, he gave his sermon, *Of the humanity and charity of Christians*, to the Suffolk Feast in London. This was published the following year with a title page that touted Clagett's position as "Preacher to the Honourable Society of *Greys Inn*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his *Majesty*," so it appears that he continued in his position under James II. In this sermon, he told the revelers that empathy was a quintessential human quality, and that "to *Man* only of all Creatures under Heaven, God has given this quality, to be affected with the Grief and with the Joy of those of his own kind; and to feel the Evils which others feel, that we may be universally

---

<sup>51</sup> Clagett. *Sermons on the following subjects...* (London, 1720), 474

disposed to help and relieve one another."<sup>52</sup> All men were thus given the ability to be and do good by God. This separated men from brutes and good Christians from bad. Like many of his contemporaries, Clagett also believed that the affections and passions should be properly moderated and focused on spiritual goals; but much like the Cambridge Platonists (to whom he was connected through both institutional affiliation and philosophical similarity), Clagett argued against the notion that affections for fellow humans was a sin and result of earthly attachment.<sup>53</sup> He thus provides evidence of the Cambridge Platonists' influence in the later seventeenth century.<sup>54</sup>

Following the Revolution of 1688, the tone of sermons took a significant turn, as Mary II filled the Church with leaders who were sympathetic to her desire for toleration and peace within the Church.<sup>55</sup> Edward Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester, active participant in the Revolution of 1688 and latitudinarian, provides one example of Mary's support of the Cambridge Platonic embrace of the passions.<sup>56</sup> Mary appointed Fowler to the Chaplaincy in 1689, and to the see of Gloucester in 1691. Shortly after her death he published, *A discourse of the great disingenuity & unreasonableness of repining at afflicting Providences*, in which he provided instruction to his

---

<sup>52</sup> William Clagett, *Of the humanity and charity of Christians* (London, 1687).

<sup>53</sup> Clagett's sermon on Job 11:10, written after the death of his son counseled Christians to see death as a reminder to "disengage our Affections from worldly things..." Idem, *Seventeen sermons preach'd upon several occasions* (London, 1694, 1699), 425. This sermon on Job 11:10 was read to Mary II on her deathbed. William E. Burns, "Clagett, William (1646–1688)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5426>, accessed Feb. 14, 2015].

<sup>54</sup> For another example of a similar approach to the passions in a posthumously-published sermon by one of Charles II's Chaplains see, Benjamin Calamy, *Sermons preach'd on several occasions* (London, 1715), especially "the Sixth Sermon."

<sup>55</sup> See Zook (2014).

<sup>56</sup> In 1670, Fowler published *The principles and practices of certaine moderate divines of the Church of England abusively called latitudinarians (greatly misunderstood)*... (London, 1671). He was a full supporter of the cause of toleration associated with both latitudinarians and the Cambridge Platonists.



readers on proper mourning.<sup>57</sup> Like Cave, he argued that Christians must "Chearfully Comply with Gods Ends and Designs," and therefore, should be cautious about grief over a worldly loss.<sup>58</sup> Unlike Cave, however, Fowler emphasized that it was correct to "use...Natural Expressions of Grief under Afflictions," according to the worthiness of the affliction, "Onely we must do all that lies in us not to be immoderate Mourners: That is, we ought not to give way to so great a Dejection of Spirit, as will disable us for those Duties which an Afflicted State calleth for."<sup>59</sup> Grief was natural, but it could lead one to neglect one's duties to the state, and thus posed a danger to both individual and community. To avoid immoderate grief, the individual was to rely on his (or possibly her) own rational faculties and ability to ascertain the object's worth.

Fowler published a "corrected" edition of this work in 1707. In it, he included a section that clarified that it is easier "to Satisfie our Reason, than to bring our Passions under the Government thereof; and especially in reference to the Bearing of Afflictions." He urged his flock to turn to God to ask for support so that the afflicted not "be so over-power'd with Melancholy, as to be unable to think a Wise Thought," and be distracted from spiritual considerations.<sup>60</sup> However, passions were natural; so, instead of complete suppression, Fowler counseled a sort of *via media* of the emotions. This is best illustrated by his description of Mary's own emotional comportment, which was held up as exemplary after her death in 1695: "She did not seem to have anything of Melancholy in Her Natural Complexion, and yet, which is very

---

<sup>57</sup> On his appointment and relationship with Mary II, see Zook (2014), 107.

<sup>58</sup> Edward Fowler, *A discourse of the great disingenuity & unreasonableness of repining at afflicting Providences* (1695), 27.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid. 33-34. Fowler also praised Mary for her evident tenderness towards her husband. This will be discussed in a later chapter.

<sup>60</sup> Edward Fowler, *A discourse of the great disingenuity and unreasonableness of repining at afflicting providences: And of the influence which they ought to have...* (London, 1707), 94-95.

Extraordinary, She was at a great distance from the other Extreme. She was Easie, Free, and Chearful, but without the least appearance of Levity. She would neither be overwhelmed with Grief, nor transported with Joy, and yet was far from a Stoick."<sup>61</sup> Under this ideal, one was to not be stoic and suppress emotion, but neither should one allow their emotions rule them and make them irrational.

Grief was natural and God-given, but to be moderated by reason, while on the other hand, love was increasingly presented as the most rational passion of all. In 1705, Samuel Clarke, then Chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich gave a sermon before of Queen Anne that emphasized the Christian duty of love. According to Clarke, the purpose of religion was to cause men "to extend their Love and Goodness and Charity to all their Fellow-Creatures," and oblige them to "govern the Passions of their Mind, with Moderations; and the Appetites of their Body with Temperance."<sup>62</sup> He argued that love was a duty because God "endued us with Reason and Understanding, for that very End; that we might be able to discern between Good and Evil, and learn to choose the One and avoid the Other: He has implanted in our Minds such Affections and Dispositions, as naturally incline us to be *kind* and *friendly* and *charitable* one towards another."<sup>63</sup> Love was thus the most rational of affections because God created man to live in communities, and "the Bond of all Society is mutual Love, Charity, and Friendship."<sup>64</sup> God created man with the capacity for love, because it created peace and accord within human societies. It was therefore rational for humans to love one another.

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid. 8.

<sup>62</sup> Samuel Clarke, *The great Duty of Universal Love and Charity: A Sermon Preached before the Queen at St. James's Chapel on December the 30th, 1705* (London, 1708), 2.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 8.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 4.

In 1707, Anne appointed Clarke to Chaplain in ordinary.<sup>65</sup> Though his sermon on the Christian duty of love was not likely the only reason for his appointment, it suggests that Anne was not averse to this Enlightened approach to temporal affections. In fact, the 1705 sermon was published at her behest, so it seems that she found something in Clarke's call for peace through love worth disseminating to a wider audience.<sup>66</sup>

Passions became a useful tool for those who sought to further a specific agenda, and were employed by those who sought to quiet disagreements within the kingdom. Employing them, however, required a shift away from focus on the spiritual realm to focusing on earthly things. To achieve earthly peace, one must desire earthly good. Thomas Hayley, Chaplain in ordinary to George I, gave a sermon before the king at St. James' in 1718, which the king requested be published. This sermon, *Mutual Charity, the most perfect Bond of Christian Unity*, sought toleration and acceptance of all Protestants, and to put an end to quarrels among Christians. Hayley argued that "the uniting of Christians in Love and Affection [was] one main Design of the Gospel," and that a mark of a good Christian was to "have a mutual Affection and Concern for each other."<sup>67</sup> He argued that a lack of love was the reason behind "Differences in Opinion among common Bretheren," which showed that they were not focused on living the way God wanted them to, because "if a Love of Truth had been the only motive, which had carry'd Men into Religious Controversies, it is probable the World would have been much less troubled with them than it has been."<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> TNA, LC 5/166.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., title page.

<sup>67</sup> Thomas Hayley, *Mutual charity, the most perfect Bond of Christian Unity. A sermon preach'd before the King in the Royal Chapel at St. James's* (London, 1718), 4.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 27.

Approaching the topic from a more practical or practicable angle, Edward Young, poet and Chaplain in Ordinary to Caroline of Ansbach, gave his sermon, *A Vindication of Providence*, shortly after the death of George I. In his dedication to the new Queen, Young laid out his aim to disprove the "Error" committed by "the Vulgar, Unlearned [and] Sinful," as well as "the Learned, Wise and Good," who had been guilty of propagating the notion that the passions or affections for temporal things was immoral and a sign of self-love. He attributed this common error to "the Resentment of *present* Pain, or an indiscreet, tho' well-intended Zeal, in the recommendation of a better World." He assured the new queen that "God does not only permit, but *enable* us, and not only enable, but *enjoin* us, to be Happy; Happy to a much greater Degree than we are, That is, than we *chuse* to be."<sup>69</sup> Taking pleasure in (proper) earthly things was not a sin, but following God's design.

Young's work, like many of those discussed here, was printed in multiple editions. Young's *Vindication* went through five editions between 1727 and 1737, and continued to be printed with the shortened title, *A True Estimate of Human Life in which The Passions are Considered in a New Light* as late as 1765. This suggests that the ideas expressed in his text were gaining popularity. Nor was he the only person publishing this new approach to the passions, despite the claim of novelty in his title. The growing acceptance of this new attitude which urged affection for proper earthly objects was the result of multiple factors. It was the result of decades of debate within the Church and among dissenting groups about the role of the passions in piety. The court played a bigger role in its propagation than has previously been allowed.

Charles II appointed Clagett, who argued that passions were God-given, and should be used alongside reason in the cultivation of virtue. This approach did not become common in the

---

<sup>69</sup> Edward Young, *A Vindication of Providence: Or, a True Estimate of Human Life in which The Passions are Considered in a New Light*. 5c (London, 1737).

Chapel Royal until after the Revolution of 1688, when Mary started appointing clergymen who supported a more practical and rational approach to religion that allowed for toleration of Protestant dissenters. Mary's appointee, Edward Fowler, argued that the passions were natural and should not be suppressed, but that grief should be moderated through reason. Anne appointed Samuel Clarke less than two years after he preached the message that love of fellow men was the key to personal and communal virtue, and the most rational of the passions, because it created a more peaceful society. George I's Chaplain, Thomas Hayley, argued that love was the gospel's main purpose, and that an absence of love was to blame for religious debates causing discord. Lastly, Queen Caroline promoted Edward Young, who argued that those who viewed the passions as either the source or evidence of evil were misled by their own unhappiness and ignorance of the will of God - either way, their negative approach to the passions suggested that their reason had failed them. Discussions about the passions became increasingly complex as theologians and philosophers debated their relationship to reason and virtue; however, this complexity grew from the acceptance of the passions as potential tools for use by any reasonable, enlightened person. This acceptance was supported and disseminated - in part - through the influence of the Chapel Royal.

This is not to say that the court was the only progenitor of these ideas. The rise of print culture and the expansion of social and institutional connections created by the politicization of the public sphere meant that ideas were shared and discussed outside the court or the church. As the notion that the individual could not only create virtue in themselves, but also help others to do so gained ground, societies formed to solve the problems perceived in their society. Sirota argues that cultural initiative shifted "away from the court toward a new culture of projecting and

association."<sup>70</sup> An increasing number of societies, such as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK), were formed by both clergy and laymen during the last decade of the seventeenth century. However, just as religion cannot be completely extricated from "secular" society during this period, the court and religious societies were not mutually exclusive. Though the court no longer monopolized the public's attention, a nod from the throne rarely worked against a set goal.

#### V. Societies for the Reformation of Manners

The rise of practical, temporally-focused approaches to faith inspired a reform movement that fostered the creation of Societies for the Reformation of Manners in cities and towns around the country. According to its historians, this reform movement itself was not completely new, but a "new mutation of an old programme," which started with the Reformation.<sup>71</sup> It gained new momentum in the wake of the Revolution of 1688 amidst political turmoil and urban growth. The societies that formed in the 1680s and 1690s responded to the perceived needs of contemporary society. Rather than aiming to bring all Protestants into the Anglican fold, they focused on creating a virtuous community that included all forms of Protestantism. Their shared goal was to create a more pious and harmonious community, so the theological approaches promoted by the Societies focused on human concerns on earth, as well as in heaven. The sermons published by the Societies focused on what individuals, from laymen to kings, could do for the betterment of the community. From their inception, therefore, they were proponents of the practical Christianity such as that expounded by Fowler and Clagett. Just as these clergymen enjoyed crown support, so did the Societies.

---

<sup>70</sup> Sirota, 14.

<sup>71</sup> Carol Stewart, *The Eighteenth Century Novel and the Secularization of Ethics*, 20.

Societies for the Reformation of Manners appeared in London and other cities in England and Ireland by the early 1690s, springing from the efforts of a few zealous gentlemen.<sup>72</sup> Early declarations of the Societies cited a rise in violent crime as well as "whoring, drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, &c," which they blamed for natural disasters. A 1694 publication by the London Society warned that the "late Tremendous EARTHQUAKE in several parts of *England* and *London*" was a "*gentle warning...*[which seemed] as if God was speaking to *Us*."<sup>73</sup> Their initial goal was to put pressure on the crown and civil authorities to prosecute those who dared to "Swear and Curse, to profane the Lord's day, or be guilty of the loathsome Sin of Drunkenness." They urged local officials to seek out "the lurking Holes of Bawds, Whores, and other filthy miscreants, in order to their Conviction and Punishment according to Law."<sup>74</sup> If successful, their campaign would "influence the Whole Nation, (with *Scotland* and *Ireland*) in such wise, that we can all with one Heart, one Mind, one Soul, might fear God, honour the King, and live in Love, Unity, Peace and Concord one with another."<sup>75</sup>

Members of these Societies started publishing sermons in the 1690s. At the beginning, their numbers were quite small. According to Speck and Curtis, in 1694, there were sixteen societies in London with a total of 298 members. Their membership was a grab-bag of the middling sort - mostly skilled craftsmen, some apprentices and journeymen, with a few of the upper middling sort, such as stewards, clerks, and attorneys.<sup>76</sup> A wide range of clergymen and

---

<sup>72</sup> Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 112.

<sup>73</sup> Societies for the Reformation of Manners, *Proposals for a National Reformation of Manners, Humbly offered to the Consideration of our Magistrates & Clergy...* London, 1693/4, title page and 1. Italics and capitals in original.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid. 29.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid. 29.

<sup>76</sup> Curtis and Speck, 47. The London Societies did not keep membership rolls.

independent ministers published sermons on behalf of the Societies, including Edward Fowler, Isaac Watts, and Josiah Woodward. Initially, the movement was comprised primarily of dissenters and their sympathizers, which attracted the suspicion of high-church Anglicans who suspected the movement of working to weaken Church authority.<sup>77</sup> The notorious high-churchman Henry Sacheverell called the Reformation of Manners a "Mugril Institution" in which "every *Trades-Man* and *Mechanick*, is to take upon him the Gift of Spirit, and to Expound the difficult Passages of Scripture, and every *Justice of the Peace* is allow'd to settle its Canon, and infallibly decide what is Orthodox, or Heretical."<sup>78</sup> Daniel Defoe published a satire of the movement in 1702, calling its members hypocrites for engaging in the same activities for which they rebuked others.<sup>79</sup> However, the societies gained the support of figures such as Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, who published a letter to his bishops urging them to support the Societies' goals in 1699.<sup>80</sup> Between 1696 and 1739, at least 53 Anglican clergymen gave sermons at society meetings.<sup>81</sup>

Many historians, such as David Hayton, have insisted that these societies not only lacked royal support, but that they were openly critical of the crown.<sup>82</sup> More recently, Tony Claydon and Karen Sonnelitter have each found evidence to suggest that these societies were actually part

---

<sup>77</sup> Tina Isaacs, "The Anglican Hierarchy and the Reformation of Manners, 1688-1738," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 3 (1982): 391-411.

<sup>78</sup> Henry Sacheverell, *The character of a Low-church-man: drawn in answer to The true character of a Church-man: shewing the false pretences to that name*, (London, 1702), 17.

<sup>79</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Reformation of Manners, A Satyre* (London, 1702).

<sup>80</sup> Thomas Tenison, *His grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury's letter to the Right Reverend the Lords Bishops of his province* (London: 1699).

<sup>81</sup> Stewart, 21.

<sup>82</sup> David Hayton, "Moral Reform and Country Politics in the late-Seventeenth Century House of Commons," *Past & Present* (1990): 48-91.



of court propaganda programs. Claydon argued that William III's public support of the movements allowed the king to present "himself as a true godly magistrate."<sup>83</sup> Sonnelitter argues that royal proclamations that supported the moral reform sought by these societies were a form of propaganda, intended to show the monarch's interest in the well-being of the people.<sup>84</sup>

In the first decades of the reform movement, there was an overt connection between these reforming societies and the court. Mary, William and Anne all published declarations of support for the reform. Court efforts extended beyond formal proclamations. Some prominent proponents of the Reformation of Manners, such as Edward Fowler (discussed above), Thomas Tenison, and Joseph Addison had direct ties to the court. Fowler joined forces with other anti-Catholic clergy in his support of William III in 1688. After the Revolution, his efforts were recognized by Bishop Gilbert Burnett, who spearheaded the new king's the propaganda campaign. Fowler was appointed a royal chaplain by Mary II and subsequently became a proponent of the idea that the Protestant victory over the threat of arbitrary power and popery (that is, the Revolution) presented an ideal opportunity, even an imperative for moral reform.<sup>85</sup> According to John Spurr, Fowler was an "enthusiastic proponent" of the Reformation of Manners, and sought to unite the Anglican church by framing "this reform movement within the context of an international struggle against the anti-christian forces of Rome and France."<sup>86</sup>

The reform movement quickly gained momentum and found a wide variety of vehicles for its message. Some of the most illustrious voices of the early eighteenth century threw their

---

<sup>83</sup> Claydon (1996), 120.

<sup>84</sup> Sonnelitter, 517-542.

<sup>85</sup> On Mary's appointment of Fowler, see Zook (2014), 107.

<sup>86</sup> John Spurr, 'Fowler, Edward (1631/2–1714)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2005 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10007>, accessed 5 Dec 2014].

weight behind the efforts to reform public manners and create a more godly community. Among them were monarchs themselves. From the beginning, the movement received support from both whig and tory courts, but the SRMs sought to engage the monarchs as role models. In 1693/4, 1699, and 1701, the Societies in England, Ireland and Scotland published an *Account of the Societies of the Reformation of Manners*, which began with declarations signed by the primary members of the Societies (Lords Temporal, Judges, and Clergymen), followed by Mary's proclamation in support of the project in 1694, and that of William in 1701. The 1701 publication included an address to the king from the House of Commons. In it the Commons urged the king to employ only those who exhibited a proper aversion to vice and a dedication to piety, and to further exhibit his own virtue by bestowing favor on "Men of Piety and Virtue," to because "the Lives of Men in High and publick Stations have a Powerful Influence on the Lives of others."<sup>87</sup>

The Societies further appealed to the court by publishing sermons that presented the monarch as a model of piety, often portraying him or her in the role of heroic biblical figures. Watts' 1707 call to arms presented Anne, "a Queen of Manly Soul" as Moses poised to battle Amalek, "the most daring and profane Wretches, against whom it concerns a Christian to make his utmost efforts." Her hands were supported by Aaron and Hur as she wielded the "Rod of Faith". In Watts' summation, Aaron represented Anne's courtiers whom he urged to "encourage her Zeal to lift up this Standard against Sin, and assist her to pray for Victory." Hur represented the members of the Societies, "those Gentlemen who have form'd a Scheme for carrying on War

---

<sup>87</sup> *An Account of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, in England and Ireland, with a Persuasive to Persons of all Ranks...* (London, 1701), unpaginated (image 32 of 206). This same language was found in other *Accounts*.

with Sin and Sinners."<sup>88</sup> If London did not succeed in hastily rooting out and conquering sin, it too would experience God's "fiery Vengeance."<sup>89</sup> Specifically, Watts warned Anne that if she did not win the war against sin, "wild Enthusiasm or Immorality, [which] sow the Seeds of Treason, and turn Subjects into Rebels" would triumph.<sup>90</sup> The wages of sin would be the collapse of the monarchy, and it was Anne's job to protect it. To do so, Watts urged her to support the reform movement.

Proponents of the Reformation of Manners reminded monarchs of their duty to promote communal piety through exhortations and warnings of governmental dissolution if sin was allowed free reign. They provided further incentive for royal support by adding public loyalty to the crown as one of their objectives. Though some historians have seen the Societies' efforts to engage the support of the crown as failures, based on the fact that local judges most often refused to prosecute the offences cited by the Societies,<sup>91</sup> at least some of their members saw the monarch's role as essential to the reform project.

The main goal of these societies was to create a nation that would "live in Love, Unity, Peace and Concord one with another."<sup>92</sup> Though members of these societies had different ideas about how exactly to achieve this, they all emphasized obedience to the monarch, love of God and love of one another. John Woodhouse exhorted his congregation gathered in Salter's Hall in 1697 that, though they differed in their theology - the audience must have been primarily

---

<sup>88</sup> Isaac Watts, *A Sermon preach'd at Salters-Hall to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners in the cities of London and Westminster, October 6, 1707*, (London, 1707), 8-13. In reference to Exodus 17:11.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>91</sup> Curtis and Speck, 55-56.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 29.

comprised of non-conformists, as Woodhouse acknowledged that some in the audience were avowed Anglicans - "May our Love, and Union, grow up the better, by that of GOD, and true Goodness we see in one another!....May the Exemplary Piety of your Families, tell the World, that Divine Service is not confined to Consecrated Places!"<sup>93</sup> Woodhouse, himself a Presbyterian, supported the goal of toleration by urging a unified Protestant community.

The key to forging this community was love of God, king and neighbor. This necessitated a focus on earthly things. In his sermon given to the London and Westminster Societies in November 1697, John Shower began by insisting that religion was intended to be a "positive Institution."

That [God] had rather we should express our Love to one another, and Charity and Mercy do good in the World, than be honoured himself by Sacrifice...It must therefore be a very mistaken Notion of Religion, to imagine that any can be a very good Christian, that is not a very good Man. For Religion is not designed only for the Happiness of particular Souls in another Life, but for the Welfare of Mankind, as united in Societies in this World.<sup>94</sup>

To effect these worldly goals, reformers emphasized emotions as tools to inspire the individual to virtue. In a sermon given before the Societies in London in 1707, Isaac Watts warned that the war against sin must not be abandoned lest God become angry and exact "fiery Vengeance". Watts offered fear as an antidote to apathy: "if we take but a little Prospect of a few [of the consequences of sin], it may serve to awaken our Fear and provoke our drowzy Zeal to Activity that we may prevent them."<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> John Woodhouse, *A Sermon Preach'd at Salters-Hall to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, May 31, 1697* (London, 1697), v.

<sup>94</sup> John Shower, *A sermon preach'd to the societies for the reformation of manners, in the cities of London and Westminster, Nov. 15, 1697* (London, 1698), A2.

<sup>95</sup> Isaac Watts, *A Sermon preach'd at Salters-Hall to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners in the cities of London and Westminster, October 6, 1707* (London, 1707), 19, 23.

Most reformers, however, insisted that love was crucial in creating a godly society. In 1701, Samuel Pomfret told the societies reform required action and courage which only love could effect. He told them, while "Affection without action is like *Rachel*, beautiful but barren," once they had the "Love of Christ...fixed in [their] Hearts...it will be impossible to resist the force of it." It was not only love of Christ, but love of each other that was "the Nurse and Nourisher of Magnanimity and Courage," that would give them the strength to carry on in their work.<sup>96</sup> George Ashe likewise told the reformers gathered at St. Mary-le-Bow in 1717 they must help their neighbors repent and come to God, because "a good Man cannot but be a Friend and Patron to good laws; his Love to Vertue and the publick Good will not suffer him to be unconcerned."<sup>97</sup>

Some reformers also emphasized the importance of the family in creating the properly pious community. In 1705/6, Hugh Broughton, Consul at Venice included "A New Years Guist of Certain Preliminarys for A Sure Reformation of Manners," in a letter to Queen Anne. Among initiatives for educating the youth and the observance of Sundays and holy days, Broughton emphasized the importance of marriage for the peace of the community.

Marriages of all sortes & ranks of persons [ought to] be suitably & Affectionately made, agreeable unto the young persons for love as to their Parents & Guardians for Interest & Quality, so that good Harmony may happen in familys, For discord in perticuler [sic] families encreaseth Divisions in Parishes, which proceeds to kindle the like over Countys, & Dilates (?) over the whole Kingdome. Animositys & Divisions, which engenders Heresies, Scisms, Factions & Rebellions. Therefore, if a sure sincere vertuous Examination and Approbation of Marches could be Established by justice, so that Parents or Guardians advices & Councils be not abandoned, nor the Young peoples Passions & Follies take place, but that all Circumstances be sacredly moderated & affectionately agreed to by all partys concerned, before the Ceremony of the Church be admitted to

---

<sup>96</sup> Samuel Pomfret, *A sermon preach'd to the societies for the reformation of manners, in the cities of London and Westminster: at Salter's-Hall, Octob. 6, 1701* (London, 1701), 7, 59.

<sup>97</sup> George Ashe, *A sermon preached to the Societies for the reformation of manners, at St. Mary-le-Bow, on Monday December 31st MDCCXVI* (London 1717), 11.

marry them (which also must be allowed to be done in a publick Congregation only, during the time of Divine Service upon Sundays or Hollydays) Then wee may reasonably hope Nuptialls will prove more really happy & sacred which will encrease quiet with Happyness Godlyness & Honesty at their Respective Homes, & dilate the good effects thereof unto their neighbors, so that a generall & universall good Reformation of Manners may Flourish, Besides, the Erecting Courts of Justice for this purpose, would prevent Stolen Concerning and unequal Matches, and that no Papists marry Protestants, nor Jewes with Christians.<sup>98</sup>

It was important to create Christian families, bound by affection and love, to insure a harmonious and pious Protestant community. Reformers promoted love in sermons, print and private correspondence. They urged monarchs to support their message by promoting proper behavior and comportment, and emphasizing the importance of the family unit. As discussed in chapter five, the Hanoverians and their supporters used royal marriages as occasions to connect with the public, simultaneously promoting royal couples as models of the married state. Though the public was aware that royal marriages were not based on love, royal couples represented societal ideals of pious unions. At least one clergyman used the marriage of the Prince of Wales in 1736 to remind the court and the public of the contributions of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, evoking the memory of William and Mary as the Societies' earliest and most important proponents.<sup>99</sup>

The Societies promoted a new approach to religiosity influenced by that developed by the Cambridge Platonists in the mid-seventeenth century; the societies, along with royal and governmental support helped to bring the idea of useful passions into the mainstream. In the late seventeenth century, members of the societies propagated notions of regulating passions as the path to true piety. Passions became the motivating force that guided reason to pious

---

<sup>98</sup> British Library, ADD MS 61102, f. 91r.

<sup>99</sup> Benjamin Atkinson, *Good Princes Nursing Fathers and Nursing Mothers to the Church: A Sermon Preach'd in London, May 2, 1736, on the Marriage of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, with her Serene Highness the Princess of Sax-Gotha* (London, 1736). See chapter five below.

comportment. Warnings of the wrath of an angry God were intended to create fear, but this was most often preached alongside a message of love for both God and neighbor. In the first decades of the eighteenth century, the emphasis shifted away from dire warnings of hell fire, and towards promises of unity and peace achieved through pious love. The Societies specifically promoted love within families to create communal accord. This message was supported by later Stuart and early Hanoverian courts. As will be shown in the following chapters, this new mainstream emphasis on love as necessary to virtue helped to create a new relationship between the monarchy and the public. Instead of the image of monarchs as distant, divinely-ordained figures, once the objects of reverence and dread, eighteenth century monarchs became paternal figures to be admired, mimicked, and loved.

## VI. The "business of the common Man"?: Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, and

### Secular Virtue

The theories of the Cambridge Platonists had influence beyond religious communities. In fact, most scholars credit an accused deist and atheist, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of Shaftesbury, with the articulation and popularization of moral sentimentality.<sup>100</sup> Michael Gill identifies Shaftesbury as the link between the Cambridge Platonist philosophy and the eighteenth century Scottish Sentimentalists of the later eighteenth century.<sup>101</sup> While Shaftesbury's philosophies do share the Cambridge Platonists' ideas about virtue, his vision was far less inclusive of all ranks of the social scale. In his *An Inquiry Concerning Virtue and Merit*, first

---

<sup>100</sup> See especially: Ellison, Barker-Benfield, Gill.

<sup>101</sup> Gill; also, Barker-Benfield, 105.

published in 1699, Shaftesbury argued that passions were the key to virtue, however, they had to be closely governed. Like many churchmen, Shaftesbury counseled the necessity of governing or at least focusing "affections or passions." For Shaftesbury, however, the key to virtue was not focus on personal morality based on religious dogma, but a concern for the public good.<sup>102</sup>

...we call any creature worthy or virtuous, when it can have the notion of a public interest and can attain the speculation or science of what is morally good or ill, admirable or blameable, right or wrong...So that if a creature be generous, kind, constant, compassionate, yet if he cannot reflect on what he himself does or sees others do so as to take notice of what is worthy or honest and make that notice or conception of worth and honesty to be an object of his affection, he has not the character of being virtuous.<sup>103</sup>

Shaftesbury thus saw passions as key to both individual virtue and public good. The proper cultivation of the passions would result in virtue exhibited through proper, polite behavior.

Unlike the Cambridge Platonists, however, in his summation, true virtue could not be achieved by just anyone. Undoubtedly under the influence of his childhood tutor and physician, John Locke, Shaftesbury later argued that education was necessary to complete nature's work in the creation of virtue.

Shaftesbury was one of the earliest and most thorough proponents of moral self-governance and the utility of the passions outside of the church. Despite the wide circulation of his works, and the esteem in which modern scholars hold him, the Earl did not hold universal appeal for his contemporaries. This does not seem to have concerned him. Shaftesbury was an

---

<sup>102</sup> Shaftesbury's earlier work, *A Letter Concerning Enthusiasm* (1707), sparked debate about the role of authority in virtue. The letter elicited often heated replies from both High- and Broadchurch supporters, including Mary Astel and Edward Fowler. Shaftesbury also seems to have intended a critique of the use of Magistrates in the pursuit of virtue advocated by the Societies for the Reformation of Manners. Exploration of this debate is outside of the scope of this chapter, but does serve to show that, just like every other theological or philosophical point in the early eighteenth century, the exact role of emotions in organized religion was hotly debated. See Michael Heyd, *"Be Sober and Reasonable": The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 211-240.

<sup>103</sup> Shaftesbury, "An Inquiry Concerning Virtue or Merit," in *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, ed. Lawrence E. Klein (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 173.



elitist who thought that the upper classes held the monopoly on virtue. Achieving true virtue (and proper comportment) required a "liberal education", and access to "the best masters." It was therefore beyond the reach of "those good rustics who have been bred remote from the formed societies of men or those plain artisans and people of lower rank who...have been necessitated...to follow mean employments and wanted the opportunity and means to form themselves after the better models."<sup>104</sup>

Shaftesbury, a passionate Whig and outspoken critic of Tories and high churchmen, was himself a divisive figure. His publications sometimes elicited heated responses. *A Letter Concerning Enthusiasm* (1707), sparked debate about the role of authority in virtue. Enthusiasm had been a topic of debate (and ridicule) since at least the 1650s. In fact, the Cambridge Platonist Henry More published a text against enthusiasm in 1656. The term generally meant "fanaticism or bigotry", but it had different connotations at different times and in the hands of different authors.<sup>105</sup> Enthusiasm was inevitably viewed as a danger to society because it eschewed reason. In his 1707 text, Shaftesbury described a new sect of French enthusiasts as potential "mortal gangrene" to the "body politic."<sup>106</sup> The letter elicited often heated replies from both High- and Broadchurch supporters, including Mary Astel and Edward Fowler.<sup>107</sup> Exploration of this debate is beyond the scope of this chapter, but does serve to show that, as the idea of an innate moral sense and its use (or disuse) became more widely accepted, its exact nature was passionately debated.

---

<sup>104</sup> Shaftesbury, *Characteristics* (1999), 85-86. On Shaftesbury's elitism, see Gill.

<sup>105</sup> Cowie, 66. Heyd suggests that Henry More thought he had a tendency towards enthusiasm himself: Heyd, 94.

<sup>106</sup> Shaftesbury in Klein (1999), 9. Shaftesbury uses a body metaphor here. There was a connection between the body, emotions and religious enthusiasm, see Heyd.

<sup>107</sup> The debate carried on in some circles for decades. For instance, see *The British Journal*, June 17, 1727.

As it gained acceptance, the precise source of human virtue and the methods necessary to utilize it were debated with greater regularity in the public sphere. Shaftesbury's summation proposed that humans were indeed capable of focusing their own passions for the public good, but only with the proper, elite education. In 1725, Francis Hutcheson published his *Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections* with which he sought to counter the notion that proper governance of the passions was the province of the elite, but should be accessible to everyone.

If any should look upon some Things in this *Inquiry into the Passions* as too subtile for common Apprehension, and consequently not necessary for the Instruction of Men in *Morals*, which are the common business of Mankind: Let them consider, that the Difficulty on these Subjects arises chiefly from some *previous Notions*, equally difficult at least, which have been already receiv'd, to the great Detriment of many a *Natural Temper*; since many have been discourag'd from all Attempts of cultivating *kind generous Affections* in themselves, by a previous Notion that there are no such Affections in Nature, and that all Pretence to them was only *Disimulation, Affectation*, or at best some *unnatural Enthusiasm*. And farther, that to discover Truth on these Subjects, nothing more is necessary than a little *Attention to what passes in our own Hearts*, and consequently every Man may come to Certainty in these Points, without much Art or Knowledge of other Matters.<sup>108</sup>

Hutcheson argued that the inclination to virtue was innate and God-given. Unlike Shaftesbury's elitist theory that an expensive education was requisite to proper emotional comportment, and thus, virtue, Hutcheson - like some latitudinarian divines - saw virtue as the "common business of Mankind."

Hutcheson's essay elicited a retort from the aged Gilbert Burnet. This led to a lively exchange between Burnet and Hutcheson, initially published in the *London Journal*, and later in a single volume. Burnet found fault with Hutcheson's emphasis on the individual's innate moral compass. Hutcheson's reply claimed an approach, reminiscent of the Reformation of Manners, that sought to "recommend *Virtue* to the World, and especially to the *Highest Part* of it, upon

---

<sup>108</sup> Francis Hutcheson, *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections* (London, 1728), v-vi.

whose Example and Influence so much of the Virtue of the *Lower Rank* of Men depends."<sup>109</sup> Quoting his own *Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, Hutcheson maintained that God "has made *Virtue a Lovely Form*, to excite our Pursuit of it; and has given us *strong Affections* to be the Springs of each virtuous Action."<sup>110</sup> That is, humans, by nature, are drawn to pleasure. Beauty creates pleasure and humans are naturally inclined to seek it. Virtue, in Hutcheson's summation, is a thing of beauty, and thus, creates pleasure. Humans therefore need only follow their own internal attraction to beauty, which is made stronger by affection for it, to guide themselves to virtue. This same principle also inclines one to the public good. Hutcheson highlights his "ingenious Thought", that pleasant associations with one's country provide the foundation for "National Love"; likewise, "Tyranny and Faction....destroys this *National Love*."<sup>111</sup>

This debate continued for eight months in 1725 and contributed to suspicions about Hutcheson's religious leanings. Hutcheson insisted on the "moral sense" as the ideal guide to virtue, while Burnet maintained that passions were only an incitement to virtue, but reason was the only reliable guide. Reason was to be informed and molded by education and proper, elite models. Though Hutcheson seems to have agreed with aspects of Burnet's emphasis on elite education, he maintained that the passions were the driving force behind the individual's moral compass.

Whether God-given or achieved through education, proper self-governance became a matter of debate in the public sphere in the early decades of the eighteenth century. These

---

<sup>109</sup> *Letters Between the Late Mr. Gilbert Burnet, and Mr. Hutcheson, Concerning The true Foundation of Virtue or Moral Goodness* (London, 1735), 1.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 6-7.

debates centered around notions of the source and nature of virtue, but virtue increasingly became linked with the public good and aided in spreading "National Love". Cultivation of virtue benefited the individual's spiritual health, which was also a proponent of public good. The passions had become widely accepted as the "Springs of each virtuous Action," whether governed through the guidance of elite education, or by following one's heart.

## VI. Conclusion

Enlightenment embrace of the passions in England thus developed, in part, as a reaction to the negative influences of Puritan predestinarian theology and Hobbesian philosophy. The Cambridge Platonists set out to show that all humans were capable of virtue. This implied that the passions were no longer evidence of humanity's most base compulsions that would inevitably lead to sin and social chaos if left ungoverned. Even the most natural of human passions, such as love of one's children or spouse was seen as evidence of attachment to temporal existence and self-love. The Cambridge Platonists sought to counter this negative view of humanity with one that gave greater agency to the individual. Though it was not entirely cohesive, their theology expounded the notion that man was not only capable of achieving individual virtue, but also of creating a pious and peaceful community, free from the religious strife of the interregnum and early Restoration. At the same time, Descartes' theory about the connection between the mind and body that allowed greater control over individual passions gained ground in intellectual circles, thus influencing the Cambridge theologians to some degree. Likewise, Locke's theory of the *tabula rasa* took much of the blame for sin off of the individual. These different, often contentious approaches to basic human problems were slowly disseminated and embraced by the wider public. The main source of this dissemination was the pulpit. Those who could not understand Cartesian dualism or Lockean notions of human nature could understand these issues

in terms of their relationship to God. Preachers wrote for their audiences. They were better judges of what their flocks were capable of understanding than we are and they did not discuss these issues in intellectual terms.

These different ideas about the relationship between mind and body, the individual and God, and the individual and the community slowly made their way into mainstream culture. They were increasingly embraced by both the royal court and the popular press. I argue that much of this came through the efforts of the Society for the Reformation of Manners, which, like the rest of society, came to see emotions as a "spring" to virtue that would create godly communities. The prominence of this approach in pastoral care, which led to its embrace in the political sphere, grew in the wake of the Revolution of 1688/9. I posit that this was evidence of a decrease in anxiety about the state of the body politic. Dissenters were given freedom to worship with the Act of Toleration in 1689. England also gained a Protestant dynasty that was secured by the Act of Settlement in 1701. Though there was certainly anxiety during the transition to Hanoverian rule in 1714, it was nothing like the turmoil of the 1640s or 1680s. I suggest that this increased embrace of sensibility or moral sentimentality may be seen as evidence of a turn toward (relative) domestic peace both in politics and society at large. Proper affective expression was evidence of balance and virtue. It thus represented social equilibrium and one step towards creating that equilibrium. The question remains as to who led this charge. The following chapters will explore the court's role in the dissemination and utilization of these developments in the public sphere.

## CHAPTER THREE

### "SHARE WITH ME IN MY GRIEF AND AFFLICTION": ROYAL DEATH AND PUBLIC MOURNING

On March 5, 1695, a procession of more than a thousand mourners accompanied the body of Queen Mary II from Whitehall Palace to its final interment in Westminster Abbey. The event would prove to be the last lavish, "public" funeral for an English monarch for the next two centuries. Two months later, Parliament allowed the Licensing Act, which had ensured crown control over the print industry in England, to lapse. The cessation of these two traditions in England was part of a transformation in the relationship between the monarchy and the public sphere. During the eighteenth century, courts arranged ever more "private" funerals, displacing the locus of public mourning on the occasion of a monarch's death. Comparing the funerals of the later Stuarts and the early Hanoverians to the lavish funeral of Queen Mary II in 1695, scholars argue that the royal funeral became less ostentatious, but also that the public was increasingly restricted from the ceremony. Michael Schaich argues this is evidence of a deliberate attempt to exclude "the poor men and women who represented the nation's commoners."<sup>1</sup> Moving the funeral behind closed doors did not, however, exclude the common subjects entirely. As funerals moved out of the public view, public mourning of the royal death became more intimate, more personal, and surviving members of the royal family mourned more publicly in print. Royal expressions of grief, disseminated widely in newspapers and broadsides,

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael Schaich, "Funerals of the British Monarchy," in *Monarchy and Religion: The Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 438.

became more familial and more emotional. These expressions were increasingly lauded and reciprocally expressed by the public. Queen Anne's reign was the turning point of these changes in affective norms. Over the course of her life, Anne experienced very real, very public losses through seventeen pregnancies that resulted in no living heirs and the loss of her husband during her reign. At her death, she was lauded as *a woman of sorrowful Spirit* (1 Samuel 1:15). The image of a properly grieving monarch was therefore introduced into the culture. Monarchs were held up as figures to be imitated, and grief, not restraint, became necessary to proper mourning. This image of a queen (and later, king) experiencing very human emotions also contributed to the humanizing of the monarchy. Along with other factors such as religious changes discussed in the previous chapter, this created the more private, family-centered funeral. As the ceremony moved behind closed doors, monarchs grieved more openly in public, and his or her subjects mourned with them.

Numerous publications flourished in the early eighteenth century as a result of the revocation of official censorship, providing a new arena for public expression and exchange of grief. These printed exchanges of grief created what I refer to as dialogues between the new monarch and their subjects. The proliferation of printed sermons also provided instruction to a mourning public. First, this chapter examines the published dialogues between the sovereign and the members of Parliament, city officials, and borough representatives in newspapers, such as the *London Gazette* and *London Journal*. I show how a proliferating print culture encouraged a rhetoric of grief in expressions of loyalty to the monarchy, by tracing the growth of the printed dialogue surrounding the death of one monarch and accession of the next. In the first decades of the eighteenth century, as royal funerals became more private, the dialogue between the new monarch and his or her subjects claimed a larger place in the public sphere. At the beginning of

Anne's reign in 1702, expressions of grief in this dialogue were subdued. By the accession of George II in 1727, both the king and politicians were more effusive in mourning the deceased king. I argue that, though this dialogue was not intended to take the place of the traditional public funeral, it projected the image of a grieving monarch to an ever-larger audience. I then examine the political functions of this dialogue, the language of which was designed to elicit political support for all participants. This analysis suggests that because this increasingly emotive dialogue was presented to a broader audience, it was both a reaction to and a proponent of the growing culture of sensibility, both in the political sphere and the wider culture. Finally, for a broader perspective of attitudes towards mourning, I turn to sermons printed to commemorate royal deaths. As monarchs mourned more fervently in public, clergymen likewise counselled grief as the key to being in both the monarch's and God's good graces.

### I. Royal Death in the Early Eighteenth Century

Historians often compare the royal funerals of the early eighteenth century to the extremely lavish funeral for Queen Mary II on March 5, 1695. This ceremony consisted of an extensive public procession and ceremonial trappings, including purple and black velvet drapings, a canopy and hearse designed by Sir Christopher Wren, a piece composed by Henry Purcell, costing a total of £50,000.<sup>2</sup> Historians see this ceremony as the norm, when in actuality, it was unusual in its pomp and ostentation. Scholars suggest that the amount of money dedicated to Mary's funeral might have been the result of political situation. Mary died less than a decade after she and her Dutch husband unseated the reigning James II and claimed the English crown for themselves as the rightful Protestant heirs. But it was Mary's hereditary claim, not William's,

---

<sup>2</sup> Ralph Houlbrooke, "The Age of Decency: 1660-1760," in *Death in England: An Illustrated History*, Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings, eds. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999), 188; Schaich, 423.



who would rule alone after her death. Alex Garganigo posits that Mary's elaborate funeral and the mourning literature produced to commemorate it was all part of a scheme to bolster support for William's solo rule.<sup>3</sup> Prior to Mary's death, the last royal funeral, that for Charles II in 1685, was a comparatively quiet affair. In 1708, newspapers made clear that the private style of the funeral for Queen Anne's consort was deliberate and that he was "to be interr'd privately, as King Charles II was."<sup>4</sup> Funerals were based on precedent, but precedents varied from the lavish public funeral of Elizabeth I to the private funeral of Charles II.

Whether a public or private funeral was planned, procedures following royal deaths shared some basic elements, details of which were changed to suit circumstances. Following a reigning monarch's death, a council was appointed to oversee the removal and interment of the deceased's remains. An autopsy was performed on the monarch's body. The corpse was then embalmed, and the royal bowels were buried in Henry VII's Chapel in Westminster Abbey.<sup>5</sup> The body then lay in state for a varying amount of time. Princess Anne's son, the Duke of Gloucester, who died at age 11, before his mother came to the throne, lay in the Prince's Chamber in Westminster for five days in August 1700.<sup>6</sup> Prince George, Anne's husband, lay in state in the

---

<sup>3</sup> Alex Garganigo, "William without Mary: Mourning Sensibility in the Public Sphere," *Seventeenth Century* 23:1 (2008): 105-41.

<sup>4</sup> *Post Boy with Freshest Advices Foreign and Domestick*, October 30-November 2, 1708.

<sup>5</sup> I have found two pieces of evidence to support this. Narcissus Luttrell noted that the bowells of Queen Anne's husband, Prince George, were buried on November 2, 1708, five days after the Prince's death; in Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714* Vol 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1857), 368. The same treatment of Queen Anne's remains was noted in The National Archives Online Catalogue, "Minutes and Account of Privy Council Proceedings following the death of Queen Anne," August 2, 1714, PC 1: Privy Council and Privy Office: Unbound. Vol. 2 (August 1-17, 1714), no. 245.

<sup>6</sup> Luttrell, vol. 4, 673, 675; *London Post with Intelligence Foreign and Domestic*, August 7-9, 1700 (Issue 184). Olivia Bland states that the duke's body lay in state in Whitehall, but does not cite her source, in Idem, *The Royal Way of Death* (London: Constable, 1986), 82; The *London Gazette* states that the prince's body lay in state August 2-10, in *London Gazette*, August 8-10, 1700 (Issue 3626).

Painted Chamber in Westminster from Thursday November 11 until its interment on the evening of November 13.<sup>7</sup> King William III, who died on March 8, 1702, lay in state in Kensington Palace from March 26 to April 12; though, Narcissus Luttrell's journal entries suggest that this extended stay was unintentional.<sup>8</sup> According to Schaich, Anne's funeral was the first of many in the eighteenth century to reduce the period of laying in state to twenty-four hours.<sup>9</sup>

On the appointed day, the royal body was transported by hearse from the location where it had lay in state to Westminster, where it was interred in Henry VII's Chapel at night, often at midnight. The ceremony included a procession of varying lengths, depending on where the body had lain. After being transferred "privately" to the Prince's Chamber in Westminster for its laying in state, the Duke of Gloucester's body had a relatively short distance to travel within Westminster, while William III's procession covered the considerable distance from Kensington to Westminster. Those in attendance at the interment were restricted to court officials, members of the royal household, and the upper nobility. The number of participants decreased over the course of the eighteenth century.<sup>10</sup> As the body, under a canopy of black or purple velvet, was carried into Westminster Abbey it was sometimes accompanied by a hymn sung by a choir.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Luttrell, vol. 6, 370, 372. Prior to this, the Prince's body had remained at Kensington.

<sup>8</sup> Luttrell, vol. 5, 156, 161-2. According to Luttrell, the date of the king's interment was changed several times, but does not make clear the reasons for the changes. As in many cases, he relied on the "public prints" to announce the actual burial of the king. For instance, *English Post with News Foreign and Domestic*, April 10-13 (Issue 235).

<sup>9</sup> Schaich, "The Funerals of the British Monarchy," 436. I think she actually lay in state at Kensington for a longer period. Newspaper account is unclear: *LG*, August 24-28, 1714.

<sup>10</sup> Schaich, 423.

<sup>11</sup> This may have been the case for all funerals of the period, but the accounts available outside of the archives are inconsistent in their reports. The *London Gazette* reported that Anne's interment was accompanied by a hymn, but no mention of such is made in available reports of other funerals: *LG*, August 24-28, 1714.

Amidst preparations for the funeral, it was also necessary to inform the public. It was important that the throne never to appear vacant, so proclamations were made as soon as possible to declare the new monarch to the public.<sup>12</sup> Within a few days, the new monarch gave a speech to the Privy Council or Parliament and this was printed in newspapers and broadsides, often alongside the news of the royal death. After the publication of the first royal speech in the official *London Gazette*, the paper's subsequent issues were largely filled with addresses of condolence and congratulations to the monarch from representatives of boroughs, counties, and corporations throughout the realm. The main purpose of these addresses was to exhibit loyalty to the monarchy and the new king or queen, often in hopes of royal or political favour. While these loyal addresses were presented in person at court, a growing number of them were also printed for consumption by a wider audience. They started to appear in the newspapers weeks before the funeral took place. Though loyal addresses were not intended to commemorate or replace the funeral, they became more prominent in print as royal funerals became more private. The death of Mary II in 1695 was a turning point for the public's relationship to royal deaths. It was unusual in its grandeur; the last public funeral had been held not for a member of the royal family, but for a military hero, George Monk, Duke of Albermarle, in 1670. The event also elicited a flood of (mostly court-authored) commemorative texts, including a long and detailed account of Mary's funeral in the *London Gazette*.<sup>13</sup>

Mary's funeral, a massive display of grandeur and public mourning, was one of the most widely attended funerals in early modern England. The event is viewed as an elaborate attempt

---

<sup>12</sup> These proclamations are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4 below.

<sup>13</sup> Alex Garganigo, "William without Mary: Mourning Sensibly in the Public Sphere," *Seventeenth Century Journal*, 23 (2008), 105–41.

by the court to shore up support for Mary's unpopular Dutch husband, William III who was left to rule alone and lead a war against France.<sup>14</sup> The form of the ceremony was based largely on precedents set by the funerals for Elizabeth I (1603) and James I (1625). It was a lavish occasion, consisting of a public procession of both Houses of Parliament along with other civic and church officials, interspersed by heralds carrying standards and banners bearing heraldic insignia. No cost was spared in providing the ceremonial trappings for the occasion. The procession route was hung with black cloth, and Mary's body was carried on a hearse with a great canopy designed by Sir Christopher Wren. All this, combined with the commission for music composed by Henry Purcell, made Mary's funeral the most expensive to date in English history, costing some £50,000.<sup>15</sup> Not only were the funeral procession and service attended by thousands of mourners, but her lying in state preceding the opulent obsequies lasted for ten days and attracted such a mass of people that hats were crushed, wigs lost, and, reportedly, a few individuals were injured or killed.<sup>16</sup> A royal funeral such as Mary's served as an opportunity for the public to exhibit their loyalty to the monarch and the continuing dynasty through expressions of grief.

Almost immediately following Mary's death, effusions of mourning poured forth in printed sermons, pamphlets, broadsides, and addresses. Many of these commemorations

---

<sup>14</sup> Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 78. On the use of print as royal propaganda, see Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996); Benjamin F. Klein, "'The Splendor of this Solemnity': Royal Ceremony and Celebration in Late Stuart England, 1660–1714" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brown University, 2002). On the problems associated with the term 'propaganda', see Dougal Shaw, "Nothing but Propaganda? Historians and the Study of Early Modern Royal Ritual," *Cultural and Social History*, 1 (2004), 139–58.

<sup>15</sup> Ralph Houlbrooke, "The Age of Decency: 1660–1760," in *Death in England: An Illustrated History*, eds Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1999), 174–201 (188); Michael Schaich, "Funerals of the British Monarchy," in *Monarchy and Religion: The Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Michael Schaich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 421–50 (423).

<sup>16</sup> Schaich, 424.

simultaneously warned against the dangers of grieving too much.<sup>17</sup> Politicians from different parts of the country travelled to Kensington to declare their loyalty to the grief-stricken king. Most of their loyal addresses were listed in the *London Gazette*, but only a few were printed verbatim. Though a few of these addressors expressed their own "deep sorrow" at the queen's demise, most commented only on their wish to "condole" with the king. The most expressive of these addresses also besought the king to 'moderate' or 'not indulge' his grief. A similar approach was counselled in many of the sermons printed to commemorate Mary's death.<sup>18</sup> The message was clear: grief was appropriate, but potentially dangerous, and should be treated with caution.

William's initial responses to these addresses betrayed his own dismay over the sudden death of his wife. In the first issue of the *London Gazette* following Mary's death, William thanked the House of Peers for their "kindness to [himself]," but more for the "Sense [they] shew[ed] of [their] Great Loss, which [was] above what [he could] Express." On the same page, the king told the House of Commons that he appreciated their "Care of [himself] and the Publick, especially at this time, when [he was] able to think of nothing but [their] great Loss."<sup>19</sup> After this

---

<sup>17</sup> Garganigo, "William without Mary," 108–09.

<sup>18</sup> See, for instance, Richard Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Mourning and the Great Concern of Preparing Our Selves for Death Practically Considered* (London, 1695); William Bentley, *A Sermon, Occasionally Preached on the Funeral of our late Sovereign William the III, King of England Scotland, France, and Ireland; Who was Solemnly Interr'd in Henry the 7th Chappel in the Abby of Westminster, on Sunday April the 12, 1702* (London, 1702); William Ayloffe, *The Government of the Passions According to the Rules of Reason and Religion* (London, 1704); and John Davy, *Mourning and Morality Consider'd in a Sermon Occasion'd by the Death of His Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark Preach'd (and since Enlarg'd) at Croydon, in Surrey, November 21, 1708* (London, 1708). *The Spectator* (September 26, 1712) published a discussion of melancholy that urged the reader to be wary of the behaviour associated with this 'unsociable state'. Garganigo also notes that mourning manuals published following Mary's death in 1695 warned against grieving too much, 108-109.

<sup>19</sup> *LG*, December 27-31, 1694. During the early eighteenth century, the *Gazette* and other papers still used Lady Day dating system in which 25 March marked the New Year. In the references below, I have provided the years for both the Lady Day and the Gregorian calendars where appropriate.

early effusion of grief, he received his subjects' addresses "very graciously."<sup>20</sup> Though these printed exchanges are evidence that some subjects sought to support the king through their addresses, Mary's death elicited fewer addresses than her successors' deaths, and few were printed verbatim.<sup>21</sup>

Seven years later, William's funeral was vastly different from that of his wife. Shortly after his death, one paper reported that the king's body was to be buried "in a Decent and Solemn way, tho not in the nature of a Publick Funeral."<sup>22</sup> This 'private' funeral took place on the night of April 12, 1702. It consisted of a lengthy procession from Kensington Palace to Westminster Abbey, lit by some six hundred flambeaux carried by the footmen who accompanied the "numerous Train of Mourning Coaches belonging to the Nobility" and foot guards with drums.<sup>23</sup> The great number of nobility and politicians in varying textures of black processing in a brilliantly lit line must have attracted attention; however, the court took steps to restrict public access to the event. The gates of Hyde Park and Westminster Yard were ordered to remain shut until the end of the funeral, and rails were constructed along the processional route.<sup>24</sup>

Just as William's funeral had been a more modest affair than Mary's, newspaper coverage of the event was likewise significantly reduced. In 1695, the *London Gazette* had

---

<sup>20</sup> *LG*, January 10-14, 1694/5.

<sup>21</sup> According to Mark Knights (*Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 123–24, there were only two hundred addresses presented to William following Mary's death, compared to the four hundred presented to Queen Anne after William's death. Those presented in 1694/5 were "highly formulaic." In this case, those that were printed verbatim appear to be the exception.

<sup>22</sup> *Post Man and Historical Account*, March 19-21, 1701/2.

<sup>23</sup> *English Post with News Foreign and Domestic*, April 10-13, 1702.

<sup>24</sup> Kew, The National Archives (hereafter TNA), LC – Records of the Lord Chamberlain, 2/14/2; PC – Records of the Privy Council, 6/15, ff. 70<sup>r</sup>–71<sup>r</sup>, 82<sup>r</sup>.

dedicated a full issue to an illustrated description of Mary's funeral procession, but it described William's funeral in a single paragraph buried at the end of five pages of addresses to the new Queen Anne.<sup>25</sup> Though the coverage of the funeral itself was minimal, William's death was acknowledged in the printed dialogue between Queen Anne and her subjects. In her first speech to her Privy Council, which was printed in the *London Gazette* the following day, Anne began with an acknowledgement of William's death:

I am extremely Sensible of the General Misfortune of these Kingdoms, in the unspeakable Loss of the King, and of the great Weight and Burthen it brings in particular upon My Self, which nothing could Encourage me to undergo but the great Concern I have for the Preservation of Our Religion, the Laws and Liberties of My Country.<sup>26</sup>

Three days later, she spoke to the Houses of Parliament, only obliquely addressing her own feelings by declaring that she could not "too much Lament [her] own Unhappiness, in Succeeding to the Crown so immediately after the Loss of a King, who was the great Support, not only of these Kingdoms, but of all Europe."<sup>27</sup> This carefully calculated language noted William's role in the continental war against the absolutist Catholic power of France, but neither speech contained any expressions of personal or familial relationship. According to these speeches, Anne lamented William's death because he was the "great support" of England and Europe, but she did not express any particular attachment to him.

Anne's subjects responded to her speech in their addresses proclaiming their loyalty to the new queen. These were written by representatives of the municipal, county, or corporate

---

<sup>25</sup> *LG*, April 9-12, 1702. Other papers offered slightly more detailed coverage, though they did not print multi-page commemorations of the event as the *London Gazette* did for Mary's funeral in the issue for March 4-7, 1694/5. See, for instance, *English Post with News Foreign and Domestic*, April 10-13, 1702.

<sup>26</sup> *LG*, March 5-9, 1701/2.

<sup>27</sup> *LG*, March 9-12, 1701/2.

bodies who sought to address themselves to the queen, and were presented in person by a chosen representative, escorted by a member of the nobility or court officer. Anne's succession was not the first time that subjects travelled from across the realm to address a new monarch, but this was the first time that their addresses were printed for public consumption in large quantities. The official paper, the *London Gazette* expanded its issues from two pages to upwards of six or eight to accommodate the verbatim accounts of loyal addresses. Other papers, which had begun to appear with the expiration of the Licensing Act in 1695, also made room for addresses, royal speeches, and occasional commentary on these items.

Many addresses mirrored the queen's level of affect. The representatives of both Oxford and Cambridge Universities declared that they felt 'sorrow' for the king's death, while the Borough of Weymouth sought to make the queen aware of their "drooping spirits."<sup>28</sup> Similarly, the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonality of London were "sensibly affected with the great and surprizing Loss of [their] Glorious Monarch ... and humbly crave[d] Leave to condole the same."<sup>29</sup> Occasionally, an addressor would claim to be physically affected by grief, such as the Corporation of Chipping Wycombe who offered their tears as a "just Tribute" for a prince who was a "tender Father to his people."<sup>30</sup> Such effusions of grief, however, were unusual in 1702 when the vast majority of addressors simply sought to "condole" the king's loss, even at times

---

<sup>28</sup> *LG*, March 19-23, 1701/2. See also, in the same issue, the address from the Borough of St Albans; and *LG*, March 23-26, 1701/2, for the address from the Borough of Leicester. For this example and those that follow, the list of addresses bearing the same level or type of affective language is too long to include in its entirety. Instead, I have included short lists of additional representative examples. For every reign, there were a number of addresses that did not contain any emotional language, but the number of these addresses dwindled significantly by 1727.

<sup>29</sup> *LG*, March 9-12, 1701/2. Language similar to that chosen by the London officials in 1702 was used by the High Sheriff from the County of Wilts (*LG*, March 16-19, 1701/2); the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of London, the representatives of the Counties of Bucks and Lancaster, and the representatives of the Town and Borough of New Windsor (all *LG*, March 19-23, 1701/2); the representatives of the City of Exeter and Corporation of Liverpool (*LG*, March 23-26, 1702); and representatives from the Corporation of Nottingham and the Lords Justices of Ireland (*LG*, March 26-30, 1702).

<sup>30</sup> *LG*, April 2-6, 1702.



entirely failing to mention the king's death.<sup>31</sup> As the purpose of these addresses was to express loyalty to Anne, her succession was always declared to be a mitigating factor of any grief created by William's death.

Addresses were presented in person and likely received a verbal response. According to the printed dialogue, Anne received many addresses 'very graciously', but her exact responses were only occasionally printed.<sup>32</sup> Some of her responses assured addressors of royal favour: Anne thanked both Cambridge and Oxford Universities for their addresses and promised to 'take care' of them;<sup>33</sup> similarly, she assured the Dissenting Ministers of Dublin of her 'protection'.<sup>34</sup> Replies became a more regular part of the printed dialogue under her successors, more vividly illustrating the exchange between monarch and subject.

Anne's death on August 1, 1714 marked the end of the Stuart dynasty in England. The planning committee appointed by the Privy Council decided that it was best to obey the stipulations Anne's will set out for her funeral, and, accordingly, she was buried in a manner similar to her husband, Prince George of Denmark who died in 1708.<sup>35</sup> Instead of being interred following a procession from Kensington Palace as William had been, the queen's body was moved 'privately' from Kensington to the Prince's Chamber in Westminster at midnight and with little ceremony.<sup>36</sup> At ten o'clock on August 24, the corpse was carried across the Old Palace

---

<sup>31</sup> For instance, the Representatives of Malmsbury and the City of Oxford (*LG*, March 19-23, 1701/2); the Town of Portsmouth and the Corporation of Maidenhead (*LG*, March 23-26 1702).

<sup>32</sup>For instance, see *LG*, March 23-26, 1701/2; April 2-6, 1702.

<sup>33</sup>*LG*, March 19-23, 1701/2; March 26-30, 1702.

<sup>34</sup>*LG*, April 2-6, 1702.

<sup>35</sup>TNA, PC 1/2, fol. 260r; LC 2/17.

<sup>36</sup>TNA, SP 35/1, fol. 66r.

Yard at Westminster in a procession of nobility and politicians. Though this was likely to attract spectators, measures were taken to ensure that only those in the funeral procession would gain access to the rite. The Lord Marshall published an order four days before the interment which stated that no one would be admitted into any area of the procession route, "except such as by reason of their particular Services must attend there."<sup>37</sup> Anne's funeral was thus considerably more 'private' than William's, as it consisted of a shortened procession in a confined area that could be better controlled, thus limiting the public's access even more.

Anne died without an heir and, according to the Act of Succession signed in 1701 the throne went to her cousin Georg Ludwig of Hanover, who became George I in 1714. When George I was proclaimed king, he was in Hanover, and did not travel to England for nearly two months.<sup>38</sup> While they awaited the king's arrival, the Privy Council acted as liaison between the king and his subjects. The Lord Chancellor gave a speech on George's behalf, which recounted a letter from the new king.<sup>39</sup> This letter arrived two weeks after Anne's death and was only summarized by the Lord Chamberlain, not printed verbatim. In his summary, the Lord Chamberlain made no mention of Anne's death or George's feelings on the subject.

The king's absence did not deter his English subjects from addressing him before his arrival on British soil. It thus became the job of the Lord Chamberlain and Lords Justices to act as intercessors for the king. The Commonality and Lieutenancy of London published and 'transmitted' their addresses to George by the Lords Justices. The former declared that the queen's death 'affected [them] with a just Concern and Sorrow, which nothing could have

---

<sup>37</sup> London, College of Arms (hereafter CA), Royal Funerals 'H', fol. 69'.

<sup>38</sup> *LG*, August 10-14, 1714. George landed in Greenwich on 18 September, and made his ceremonial entry into London on 20 September, seven weeks after Anne's death. See *LG*, September 18-21, 1714.

<sup>39</sup> *LG*, August 10-14, 1714.

allayed, but the Satisfaction' they received from George's accession.<sup>40</sup> Similarly, the Earl of Carlisle delivered an address to the Lords Justices that declared the officials of Cumberland County found 'sensible relief' from the "great loss" of the queen's death.

After George's arrival on September 18, 1714, his subjects were eager to make their addresses in person, and this continued through to the end of the year. These addresses were listed on the front page of most issues of the *Gazette*, though few were printed verbatim. Instead, publications such as the *Post Boy* and *Daily Courant* printed selected addresses. Despite the partisan nature of many of these publications, most addresses began with an expression of mourning for the deceased Tory queen. For instance, Colonel Thomas King's declaration of 'great Grief' over the queen's demise was printed in the Tory *Post Boy*, while the Whig *Flying Post* printed the profession of "Grief for the Loss of our late Queen," presented to the king by representatives from Gravesend and Milton.<sup>41</sup> Regardless of party affiliation, George's accession to the throne was consistently described as a remedy to their grief.<sup>42</sup>

Like Anne, George responded to his subjects' addresses (those presented in person and through intercessors), but these responses were printed with greater frequency than Anne's had been. When the king was not present to respond himself, the Lords Justices did so on his behalf. The king replied to the London officials (via the Lords Justices) that the address had given him "great Satisfaction." The city officials and Lieutenancy of London were "truly sensible of the

---

<sup>40</sup> *LG*, September 11-14, 1714. See also, the addresses from the City of Carlisle in Cumberland (*LG*, August 21-24, 1714); the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (*LG*, September 28 – October 2, 1714); the Duke of Montrose (*Flying Post*, September 25-28, 1714); and the officials of the City of Coventry (*Post Boy*, September 21-23, 1714).

<sup>41</sup> *Post Boy*, November 2-4, 1714; *Flying Post*, September 18-21, 1714.

<sup>42</sup> Mark Knights has illustrated the use of loyal addresses by both parties in *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 142-48.

great Loss of our most Excellent Queen," but received "Comfort and Satisfaction" from the king's peaceful accession. Again, the king's brief response of thanks was published directly following the address.<sup>43</sup> Addresses that were printed verbatim were almost always followed by the king's response suggesting that the response had become almost as important as the address itself.

George spent much of his time in his beloved homeland during his thirteen-year reign. He died unexpectedly on one such trip to Hanover on 11 June 1727, leaving his son George II to inherit the throne with his wife Caroline. Rumours initially spread that plans were being made to bring the king's body to England to be buried "among his ancestors."<sup>44</sup> But according to his German Chamberlain, Friedrich Ernst von Fabrice, the king's final will stipulated that his corpse was to be neither opened nor embalmed. Naturally, this necessitated a speedy burial. As the king died in Osnabrück, a burial in England was impossible. Instead, his corpse was buried at midnight 'in complete silence' in Leineschloss Church in Hanover.<sup>45</sup>

After learning of his father's death, George II addressed his council at Leicester House on June 14 in a speech that began by expressing overt grief for his father.

The sudden and unexpected Death of the King, my dearest Father, has filled my Heart with so much Concern and Surprize, that I am at a Loss how to express myself upon this great and melancholy Occasion.

He continued by noting the "immense Weight" that fell upon him by taking up the reins of such a powerful nation, but declared that his 'Love and Affection' for the country gave him 'resolve to

---

<sup>43</sup> *LG*, September 11-14, 1714.

<sup>44</sup> *Parker's Penny Post*, June 18, 1727.

<sup>45</sup> Friedrich Ernst von Fabrice, *Die Memoiren des Kammerherrn Friedrich Ernst von Fabrice*, trans. Rudolf Grieser (Hildesheim: Lax, 1956), 149; see also Ragnhild Hatton, *George I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 284.

cheerfully undergo all Difficulties for the Sake and Good of my People'.<sup>46</sup> His speech thus followed a pattern similar to Anne's first speech in 1702; however, where Anne had lamented the loss of William's leadership, George cited personal emotion as both the source of his grief and his resolve to persevere. Such an announcement likely came as a surprise to some in attendance, as the new king had had a famously sour relationship with his father.

George's speech was printed both in newspapers and broadsides. As had been the case in previous reigns, the loyal addresses presented to George II frequently echoed the level of affect expressed in his speech. As George had emphasized his familial relationship to the deceased, many of his subjects did as well. The Bishop of London, accompanied by numerous other members of the local clergy sought to "condole" with the king on the death of his "Royal Father."<sup>47</sup> The representative for the City of Exeter presented a lengthy address to the king in which he declared that, because of the protection the city had received under the king's father, its inhabitants were "under a double Obligation ... to be deeply affected with whatever can give your Royal Heart Concern and Surprize."<sup>48</sup> They did not simply lament the king's death, they were also "deeply affected" by the cause of the new king's grief.

The newspapers' coverage portrayed George II as a more active and lively participant in the conversation than his predecessors had been. Two weeks after his appearance at Leicester House, once the loyal addresses had begun to flow in, he addressed Parliament in a speech that was printed in the *Gazette*. Declaring that he wanted to 'sufficiently express the Sentiment of

---

<sup>46</sup> *LG*, June 13-17, 1727; *Daily Post*, June 17, 1727.

<sup>47</sup> *LG*, June 24-27, 1727.

<sup>48</sup> *LG*, June 24-27, 1727.

[his] own Heart', George reiterated his grief over his father's death and reminded his audience of their obligation to feel the same (by way of acknowledging it to be the case):

I am persuaded that you all Share with me in my Grief and Affliction for the Death of my late Royal Father; which, as it brings upon Me the immediate Care and Weight of the Government, adds very much to my Concern; lest I should not be as successful in my Endeavours.<sup>49</sup>

George responded to his subjects' declarations of grief by acknowledging their sincerity. He also expressed concern that he would not be able to fulfil his duties as king, for which, of course, he had been preparing most of his life.

Following this speech, many more addresses poured in, consuming the *London Gazette*, which had expanded the length of its issues, and taking center stage in many other newspapers both within and outside of London. Whether in direct response to the king's gentle reminder about his subjects' obligations or not, the addresses presented after 27 June contained more affective language than in previous years.

Representatives of the Commonality and Lieutenancy of London used significantly more emotive language to express their condolences at greater length:

The sudden and unexpected Death of your Royal Father our late most Gracious Sovereign, is a Subject of Grief too sensibly affecting us to be conceal'd; but when we consult our Reason, and reflect on our Happiness, that your Majesty is now so quietly seated on the Throne, the joyful Scene abates our Sorrow, altho' the Remembrance of his benign Reign will be ever dear to us.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> *LG*, June 24-27, 1727; June 27 - July 1, 1727. Nearly every address mentions the new monarch's vow to uphold the Protestant religion and traditional English liberties. The word 'love' is rarely used in this context prior to 1727.

<sup>50</sup> *LG*, July 1-4, 1727. See also the addresses from the City of Westminster, the Borough of St Albans, and the Mayor and Commonality of Bristol (*LG*, July 1-4, 1727); the addresses from the Protestant Dissenting Ministers in London, and the Cathedral at Chichester (*LG*, July 4-8, 1727); and the Principal and Professors of the University of King James VI (*LG*, July 18-22, 1727).

The king's printed response thanked the Lieutenancy for expressing 'so much Duty and Affection to my Person and Government'. After which, the paper reported, 'they had all the Honour to kiss His Majesty's Hand'.<sup>51</sup>

Representatives of Oxford and Cambridge Universities also followed the king's example of more expressive grief. The Oxford representatives sought to 'pay this just Tribute of [their] hearty Concern and Sorrow for the Death of [his] Royal Father', while the Cambridge address went on at greater length.<sup>52</sup>

We come with Hearts full of Affection to your Majesty ... to condole with you for the Loss of your Royal Father, our much honoured and much loved King and Patron ... Under this Loss, our greatest Comfort is in the Prospect now before us of happy Days from your Majesty's known Love of the Religion, Laws, and Liberties of this Kingdom.

As the king expressed more emotion, so too did his subjects.

The printed dialogue was considerably more complex in 1727 than it had been in 1714 or 1702. Loyal addresses were much longer and the king's direct responses were printed with greater frequency and at greater length. It was also in 1727 that this dialogue became a topic of discussion outside of the political sphere. As periodicals, such as the *London Journal*, increasingly discussed proper morality and behaviour, elite manners became a topic of speculation and critique. By 1727, the *London Journal* had effectively become a government publication, but it still devoted most of its pages to discussions of proper behaviour and affective comportment, suggesting that it had become part of the official effort to educate the populace,

---

<sup>51</sup> *LG*, July 1-4, 1727.

<sup>52</sup> *LG*, June 27– July 1, 1727; July 4-8, 1727.

called the Reformation of Manners.<sup>53</sup> The authors of the *Journal* praised George II for his declarations of suffering in the wake of his father's death and urged its readers to follow the king's example. It dedicated the front pages of (at least) two issues to the topic of George I's death. The first contained instructions on proper mourning for the dead king, and was filled with dramatic language on the author's own feelings:

The ordinary Consolations of Reason and Philosophy are ineffectual to chastise the first Transports of Grief in a pious People, mourning for their King and Father. All that we can think, and speak, and write is too little to express the Passion in the Soul; and Extravagance it self does not mean half enough.

The author conceded that he should be comforted by "Submission to the Divine Will," as preachers often counselled. However, acknowledging that in its grief his heart had 'grown willful to its own Affliction, and refuses Comfort', he begged the reader to "indulge the Passion of an honest Mind, which delights to linger on the melancholy Scene, and mingle his Affliction with that of a whole People."<sup>54</sup> This plea was made more fervent by the use of the term "Passion", which typically indicated a violent emotion.<sup>55</sup>

Readers were thus urged to grieve the king's death intensely. The author also praised George II for mourning his father, because, "What cou'd they who mourn most for their late Master desire more, than to see the King himself with filial Piety joining with their Grief, and surpassing them in it?"<sup>56</sup> The *Journal*'s acclamations not only advanced the image of a grief-

---

<sup>53</sup> Barker-Benfield, *Culture of Sensibility*, Ch. 2; Robert O. Bucholz and Joseph P. Ward, *London: A Social and Cultural History, 1550–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 164–218.

<sup>54</sup> *London Journal*, June 17, 1727.

<sup>55</sup> Christian Maurer and Laurent Jaffro, "Reading Shaftesbury's *Pathologia*: An Illustration of the Stoic Account of the Emotions," *History of European Ideas*, 39.2 (2013), 207–20.

<sup>56</sup> *London Journal*, 1 July 1727.



stricken king joining with his subjects in mourning, it also promoted the notion that subjects could unite with the monarch through the expression of grief.

## II. Mourning and the Rise of Print

The ways in which the public mourned a royal death changed in the first half of the eighteenth century. Early modern funerals, such as that for Mary II, had been lavish displays, sometimes spanning numerous days, and were used to unite the kingdom in mourning and celebration of the reigning dynasty. They were a means to smooth the transition between reigns and bolster public support for the new monarch.<sup>57</sup> During the early eighteenth century, England saw the end of a dynasty and the creation of a new one by Act of Parliament. It was a period overshadowed by the constant threat of a Jacobite incursion, which incited anxieties and sometimes riots throughout the country. It was also a period in which, largely because of the "Glorious Revolution" in 1688, the power of Parliament grew as the monarch became increasingly reliant on that representative body, and therefore, on public opinion. The early eighteenth century might thus seem an odd time to abandon any means of raising support for the reigning dynasty; yet during this period, the Lord Chamberlain, the Earl Marshal, the heralds, and the committees specially appointed to plan funerals repeatedly decided that the funerals for reigning monarchs and members of the royal family were to be "private".

In the case of the later Stuarts, each funeral was described as "private", but there has been some disagreement about what this term meant to contemporaries. Schaich's argument rests on a modern definition, that a private funeral meant one with a restricted audience, while Paul Fritz

---

<sup>57</sup> Jennifer Woodward, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570–1625* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997); see also Garganigo, "William without Mary."

argues that the term "private" entailed a ceremony with less pomp.<sup>58</sup> Contemporaries generally used the term "private" to mean a ceremony with less ostentation. Gilbert Burnet complained that King William did not receive the funeral he deserved because of economic expediency. In lieu of a "magnificent Funeral," for which some at court argued, a statue of William on horseback was to be made "to excuse the Privacy of his Funeral, which was scarce decent, so far was it from being Magnificent."<sup>59</sup> However, the heralds also used the terms "public" and "private" to determine which precedent would be used. Houlbrouke suggests that "public" funerals were those in which heraldic insignia were used. In such cases, aristocratic families would pay a fee to the College of Arms for the use of their family insignia in a "public" rite.<sup>60</sup> This distinction is less useful in terms of royal funerals, as the heralds were always involved (though perhaps not as much as they thought they ought to be). In the heralds' records of royal funerals, the distinction between "public" and "private" does seem to imply both the level of grandeur and the level of public involvement.

Though he complained about the lack of "Magnificence" at William's funeral, even Burnet recognized that the relatively subdued character of royal funerals was often a matter of economic expediency. Anne's funeral was based on the precedent set by William III's funeral, and her own plans for her husband's funeral in 1708, which followed the pattern of obsequies

---

<sup>58</sup> Schaich, "The Funerals of the British Monarchy"; Paul Fritz, "From 'Public' to 'Private': The Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1830," in *Mirrors of Morality: Studies in the Social History of Death*, ed. J. Whaley (Europa, 1981), 61 – 79.

<sup>59</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *A History of My Own Time*, vol. 2 (London, 1724), 307.

<sup>60</sup> Ralph Houlbrooke, "'Public' and 'Private' in the Funerals of the Later Stuart Gentry: Some Somerset Examples," *Mortality* 1:2 (1996), 164.

held for Charles II.<sup>61</sup> While Mary's funeral had cost £50,000, Anne's cost a mere £10,579 8s.

9d.<sup>62</sup> It would seem the new funeral style was an effective cost-cutting measure. Grand processions through London were vastly more expensive than the "private" ones. Private funerals thus held additional attraction for the cash-strapped courts of the early eighteenth century. Whether the planners of these funerals intended to exclude certain portions (or all) of the public or aspired to effect a cultural shift is unclear.<sup>63</sup>

Scholars have attributed this supposedly new trend in royal funerals to a number of factors. Ralph Houlbrooke attributes it to notions of "decency", though he admits the word itself is vague, even more so in its eighteenth-century usage.<sup>64</sup> Schaich argues that this trend towards less ostentatious obsequies was the result of "an individualized spirituality that chimed well with the Christian Enlightenment and the appearance of domestic bliss."<sup>65</sup> Some scholars see this as part of the decline of court ceremony in the early eighteenth century, but it was, in fact, the continuation of a trend that had started with the death of Henry, Duke of Gloucester in 1660.<sup>66</sup> After this event, members of the Stuart and Hanoverian families, including Charles II (d. 1685), Anne's last son William, Duke of Gloucester (d. 1700), her husband, George, Prince of Denmark

---

<sup>61</sup> The National Archives Online Catalogue, "Minutes and Account of Privy Council Proceedings following the death of Queen Anne," August 2, 1714, PC 1: Privy Council and Privy Office: Unbound. Vol. 2 (August 1-17, 1714), no. 245.

<sup>62</sup> Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 398. According to Gregg, Anne's funeral cost £5,000 less than George I's coronation.

<sup>63</sup> Luttrell claimed that at Gloucester's laying in state, only those who were in mourning were permitted to view the body. Luttrell, vol. 4, 674.

<sup>64</sup> Houlbrooke, "The Age of Decency," 174.

<sup>65</sup> Schaich, 448. According to Schaich, "domestic bliss" was best realized at the court of George III.

<sup>66</sup> CA, I 4, ff. 49<sup>r</sup>–49<sup>v</sup>.

(d. 1708), and George II's wife Caroline (d. 1737) were interred "privately."<sup>67</sup> Mary's funeral in 1695 was the exception to the rule; it was an outlier, not the standard against which other funerals should be measured. Her funeral is an example of political theatre, designed to rally support for an unpopular monarch with what many saw as a weak claim to the throne. This type of public theatre was used on occasion, mostly for military or civic heroes, to rally the nation's support, even while funerals for reigning monarchs and their families became increasingly private.<sup>68</sup>

Alas, as these committees did not think it necessary to explain their decisions, the reason behind the privatisation of royal funerals must remain somewhat elusive. I argue that no single explanation will suffice. As in the case of royal weddings discussed in Chapter five, royal funerals were planned to suit political expedience. The court needed a grand event to prop up William III's rule in 1695, less so than they needed to rally support for Queen Anne's accession in 1702. When Anne died in 1714, the court opted to follow precedent closely amidst an awkward transition from one dynasty to the next. In addition to these circumstances, the court also had to navigate changing cultural and religious expectations, as well as shifting relationships of authority. What we can examine with greater certainty is how this affected the public's relationship to the court.

---

<sup>67</sup>Private interments during the late Stuart and early Hanoverians include: Prince Rupert, 1682; King Charles II, 1685; William, Duke of Gloucester, 1700; Prince George of Denmark (Queen Anne's consort), 1708; Prince George William, 1718; Queen Caroline, 1737; Frederick, Prince of Wales, 1750; Princess Caroline, 1757; Princess Elizabeth, 1759; and King George II, 1760. See TNA, LC 2/14/1; 2/16; 2/17; 2/20/2; 2/26; 2/27; 2/36; CA, I 4.

<sup>68</sup> During the period covered by this article, the most notable public funerals for military heroes were for George Monk, Duke of Albemarle in 1670, and John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough in 1722: CA, SML 26. On Marlborough's funeral in 1722, see Michael Schaich, 'Vom Tod eines Helden. Das Staatsbegräbnis des Herzogs von Marlborough', in *Schleifspuren. Lesarten des 18. Jahrhunderts. Festschrift für Eckhart Hellmuth*, ed Anke Fischer-Kattner (Munich: August Dreesbach, 2011), 189–203.

Private funerals became increasingly exclusive, blocking the proceedings from public view. In 1702, William III's body was transported to Westminster in a lengthy nighttime procession. Though steps were taken to limit attendance at this procession, it would have undoubtedly attracted attention. Queen Anne's funeral in 1714 contained no such procession from Kensington. Instead her body was transported in a small procession that was intended to attract even less attention. In each instance, rails were put up, soldiers positioned, gates locked, and unauthorised coaches forbidden from entering the area of the event.<sup>69</sup> According to Luttrell, at the Duke of Gloucester's interment, measures were taken to keep uninvited onlookers at a distance, but this did not completely deter them:

In the evening the lords justices were at the duke of Gloucesters interment, which was performed with great order by 9 at night: the guards, consisting of 400 men, made a lane from the house of lords to the east door of Westminster Abbey to keep off the mobb, and every other man had a flambeau lighted [in] his hand, which made it visible to the spectators.<sup>70</sup>

It makes sense that the spectacle of a line of 400 guards with a substantial number of nobility would attract an audience, whether they were invited or not. Luttrell's description also suggests that there was enough interest among the London public to warrant such a substantial guard to enforce the funeral's guest list.

Measures intended to keep the public at bay became more restrictive. In 1702, the public could at least view the procession for William III from afar. By the time of George II's funeral in 1760, members of the Privy Council and planning committee had an enclosed path built across

---

<sup>69</sup> CA, Royal Funerals 1618–1738, fol. 189r.

<sup>70</sup> Luttrell, vol. 4, 675–6. A similar account of George II's funeral in 1760 exists in "Further Particulars relating to the Death, Funeral, etc. of his late Most Sacred Majesty, of blessed Memory," *London Magazine, or Gentleman's Intelligencer*, 29 (1760), 597. Cited in Schaich, 438.

the Palace yard within Westminster that would almost completely obscure the funeral procession itself from public view.<sup>71</sup> George III's court took further steps to prevent unwanted guests from gaining access to the proceedings, such as posting official notices that restricted any coaches from entering the area of the ceremony to "prevent any Interruption to the Funeral" and distributing Pass Tickets.<sup>72</sup>

The effect of such restrictions was to create a more intimate ceremony, focused on the royal family as individuals, rather than as embodiments of state power.<sup>73</sup> The trend for private funerals had been growing among the aristocracy since the early seventeenth century, though some still opted for ostentatious public processions.<sup>74</sup> Private funerals and printed dialogues were all part of the changing relationship between the monarch and the public sphere. As political power fell increasingly into the hands of Parliament, the monarch became an individual who was ever more reliant on public opinion to maintain control of domestic and foreign policy (not to mention personal income via the Civil List). The monarch's growing dependence on the goodwill of his or her subjects compelled kings and queens to become more accessible to their subjects, instead of remaining distant, divinely ordained sovereigns. One way they did this was through the expression of personal emotion.

---

<sup>71</sup> CA, I 4, ff. 114<sup>r</sup>–17<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>72</sup> CA, Royal Funerals 'H', printed broadside insert (unpaginated); ff. 108<sup>r</sup>–10<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>73</sup> Houlbrooke, "The Age of Decency," 192. Other arguments about the motivation behind the privatisation trend include finances and concerns of decorum. See Paul S. Fritz, "From 'Public' to 'Private': The Royal Funerals in England, 1500–1830," in *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death*, ed. Joachim Whaley (London: Europa, 1981), 61–79; Woodward, *Theatre of Death*, 142.

<sup>74</sup> Clare Gittings, *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England* (London: Croom Helm, 1984); CA, SML 26.

The expansion of the printing industry gave monarchs new venues for the communication of (supposedly) personal feelings and emotions, especially because the court maintained some control over what appeared in print. While publishers no longer required a licence to print material, this did not release them from government oversight. Periodicals considered by the court to be seditious or overly critical of the monarch or Parliament could still be shut down by order of the crown.<sup>75</sup> One of the most notorious cases is the *London Journal*, which was originally published on a weekly basis starting in 1720. Famous for being home to "Cato's Letters," the *Journal* was openly critical of the court and the newly shining star MP Robert Walpole. Only a couple of years after its inception, the publication was bought out by the government, because it had become popular enough to pose a political threat. By the mid- to late 1720s, the *London Journal* had become a government mouthpiece, edited by Walpole supporter James Pitt. Though the *London Journal* was not the only periodical to meet such an end, it serves as a reminder that, despite the absence of a licensing mandate, the government did maintain some control over the character and content of publications in England. Periodicals such as the *London Journal* created new avenues of communication between the court and the public. By 1727, this meant that the court could advise the public in proper loyalty, and more specifically, in proper grief.

Growth of newspapers beyond the capital increased in the first decade of the eighteenth century. Between 1701 and 1723, twenty-four newspapers were founded in the provinces.<sup>76</sup> This effectively expanded the court's ability to communicate with provincial subjects and likewise

---

<sup>75</sup> William Bragg Ewald, *Rogues, Royalty, and Reporters: The Age of Queen Anne through its Newspapers (The Newsmen of Queen Anne)* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956); repr. Nabu Press, 2011), p. 16.

<sup>76</sup> Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 227.

gave these subjects greater access to the happenings at court. Papers such as the *Ipswich Journal* and *Newcastle Courant* printed royal speeches and a selection of loyal addresses, projecting the political dialogue to a wider audience. Though many provincial papers were focused on local, mercantile, and agricultural matters, the publication of speeches and addresses suggests that it held some interest for those living outside of the capital.

The expanding role of print in the public sphere not only allowed the court to communicate with a wider audience, but also provided that audience access to the monarch on an unprecedented scale. In the grand "public" funerals of the early Stuarts, the new monarch did not appear in the funeral cortège; they were represented by a chief mourner – often a member of the immediate family – but did not walk in the procession themselves.<sup>77</sup> There was, therefore, no access granted to the new monarch's grief. The expansion of print changed this. The court was no longer restricted to the "point-of-contact" created by physical public ceremonies, but could communicate with their subjects via print. Print granted unprecedented access to monarchs and their emotions.

### III. Sincerity in the Affective *Quid Pro Quo*

The printed dialogue was essentially a selective portrayal of exchanges at court, initiated by the monarch's first speech. The language of these speeches was carefully calculated and closely analysed by contemporaries. Addressors often mimicked the tone and language of the monarch's speech. Throughout the period 1702–27, royal speeches increased in their use of affective language, but we must not conclude that this was the result of a corresponding rise in genuine emotion.

---

<sup>77</sup> CA, I 4, ff. 44<sup>r</sup>–48<sup>r</sup>. The exception to this was James I's funeral in which his son, the new Charles I, served as chief mourner.



Though both Anne and George II claimed to be affected emotionally by their predecessor's death, Anne described her feelings much more economically than George. According to her speech, Anne lamented William's death because he was the "great support" of England and Europe, but she did not express any particular attachment to the king. George II, on the other hand, declared the occasion "melancholy" because of the loss of his "dearest Father." William III was Anne's brother-in-law, and George I was George II's father. George's use of familial terms could be the result of his closer relationship to the deceased king; yet neither Anne, nor George II were on the best of terms with their predecessors. Anne's relationship with William had been problematic since its inception.<sup>78</sup> George II notoriously had a major falling out with his father a decade prior to the latter's death.<sup>79</sup> George took every opportunity to refer to the "late King, my Father," but Anne never once referred to her familial ties to William in her first speeches.

The new queen did, however, refer to William as "Our Dearest Brother" in her letter to the States General in The Hague, and as "Our Royal and Most Dearly Beloved Brother" and "Our said Most Dear and Royal Brother" in her letter to the Privy Council of Scotland. Both letters were published in the Whig *Flying Post*, but not in the official (Tory) *London Gazette*.<sup>80</sup> It is likely that there were many motivations behind these word choices, but as a Tory, Anne needed to appeal to potential political opponents. Whether she was aware that these letters were to be published in the *Flying Post* is uncertain, and we must be careful not to make too much of

---

<sup>78</sup> Robert O. Bucholz, *The Augustan Court: Queen Anne and the Decline of Court Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993); Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980).

<sup>79</sup> Andrew C. Thompson, *George II: King and Elector* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011); Jeremy Black, *The Hanoverians: The History of a Dynasty* (London: Hambledon and London, 2004).

<sup>80</sup> *The Flying Post; or, The Post-Master*, March 21-24 and 24-26, 1702.

these expressions. However, it could not have hurt to remind the Whig audience of the *Flying Post* of her familial connection to her Whig predecessor. In each case, there is no evidence to suggest that these declarations of family affection were anything but display. This could point to an early example of the "exemplification of bourgeois values," specifically that of affective family bonds, which Marilyn Morris argues "fostered a loyalist culture that was accessible to all ranks of society," in the reign of George III.<sup>81</sup> For Anne and George II, these familial declarations may have simply served as reminders to their political opponents of their claims to the throne.

These familial ties were sometimes emphasized in addresses to the new monarch, but the parts of each speech that made the biggest impression on the public were those related to the monarch's personal feelings. Anne's statement that, "I know My own Heart to be entirely English" was echoed in loyal addresses to the queen. For instance, the officials of the County of Cambridge asked for leave to express the "unfeigned thanks of true *English* Hearts."<sup>82</sup>

George II's most echoed line cannot but have been a reference to his father: "my Love and Affection to this Country, from my Knowledge and Experience of you, makes me resolve chearfully to undergo all Difficulties for the Sake and Good of my People." When George I came to the throne, he had never lived in England, nor had he spent much time there. Even his knowledge of the English language has been somewhat contested.<sup>83</sup> By the time George II ascended the throne in 1727, he had lived in England for over a decade. This line in George II's

---

<sup>81</sup> Marilyn Morris, *The British Monarchy and the French Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 140, 159.

<sup>82</sup> *LG*, March 26-30, 1702 (italics in original). See also, the address from the Borough of St Albans (*LG*, March 19-23, 1701/2); and the address from the Borough of Leicester (*LG*, March 23-26, 1701/2).

<sup>83</sup> Hatton, *George I*, 129-31.

speech was perhaps a commentary on his father's reign. George's "Love and Affection" for his country was also repeated in numerous loyal addresses. The officials from the City of Exeter thanked Providence for providing them with a king "whose Love and Affection to Britain we have such Knowledge and Experience," to replace the deceased.<sup>84</sup>

Such instances together illustrate the tendency of the public to mirror royal language. As royal speeches expressed more grief, so did the addresses. It is unlikely that all mourning expressions in either royal speeches or loyal addresses were sincere. Insincere grief was a problem discussed by preachers throughout the period. Despite the unlikelihood of sincerity in the new monarchs' grief over their predecessors, the public, at least the upper echelons represented here, mirrored their expressions.

The appearance of royal responses following printed addresses grew in frequency and detail throughout the period. Anne's printed responses were sparse, brief, and rarely emotive. George I responded more frequently, at greater length, and, importantly, using more affective rhetoric. He thanked the University of Cambridge for their "very Dutiful and Affectionate Expressions" and promised that he would not "fall short" of his predecessors in his "Zeal" for the Church of England.<sup>85</sup> The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel declared their confidence in George's "Zeal and Affection" for the Protestant religion, and in return, George assured them they would always meet his "Favour and Encouragement."<sup>86</sup> George II followed his father's example, but with greater verbosity. He thanked London officials for their "early Marks of Zeal and Affection," in their address presented on June 13, 1727. In the next issue, some of the upper

---

<sup>84</sup> *LG*, June 24-27, 1727. See also, addresses from the Borough of Reading (*LG*, July 1-4, 1727); and from the Diocese of Norwich (*LG*, 4-8 July 4-8, 1727).

<sup>85</sup> *LG*, September 21-25, 1714.

<sup>86</sup> *LG*, September 28 –October 2, 1714.

clergy from London sought to condole the death of George's "Royal Father" whose "paternal Care over his People" made him "dear." The new king responded in greater length:

This early Testimony of your Duty and Loyalty, and the just Sense you have of my affectionate Concern for the Established Church, for the Happiness of my People are very pleasing and acceptable to me. And you may be firmly assured, that the Protection of the Church and Clergy, in the Enjoyment of their Rights and Privileges, shall be my particular Care through the whole Course of my Reign.<sup>87</sup>

George's response gives the sense of a *quid pro quo* arrangement, but the exchange is based in affective terms. The clergy reminded the new king of the royal favor (or "paternal Care") granted to them by his father, and in return George assured them of his 'affectionate Concern' for the Anglican Church.

Printed royal replies presented kings as responsive to their subjects. In addition, the increase in affective language showed monarchs to be more "sensible" to their declarations. This suggests the growing importance of this exchange, both to the court and in public opinion. George I and, to some extent, George II were both in need of public support and the intentional dissemination of this exchange may have been part of the effort to rally that support.

More importantly, rather than providing evidence of changes in feeling toward the monarch, this dialogue illustrates a change in political culture. Addresses were intended to gain royal notice and favour. Writers often reminded the sovereign of favour received under the previous reign. Monarchs responded in print more frequently, promising protection or care, suggesting a *quid pro quo* character to these exchanges. These promises of political favour on both sides show that the ultimate goal of the exchange of affective expressions or demonstrations of shared grief was the cultivation of political relationships.

---

<sup>87</sup> LG, June 24-27, 1727.

Through these dialogues, monarchs helped to shape popular notions of proper affective comportment. As models of proper elite behavior, when kings and queens expressed grief in print, they told the public that this was the appropriate sentiment and mode of expression. I suggest that such dialogues should thus be seen as another way monarchs and their courts sought to reform the manners of the masses - or at least the manners of the elites. Conversely, George II's to public grief over the death of his father in 1727 is further evidence of the changes in attitudes towards emotions outlined in chapter two. More specifically, it followed decades of debate on the dangers and propriety of grief in religious circles. These debates made their way into diatribes in the *London Journal*, but most people likely heard them in some form from the pulpit.

#### IV. Moral Mourning

A flurry of sermons, poetry and histories, in multiple languages followed a royal death. In some cases, contributions were openly solicited from members of the public.<sup>88</sup> Those who did not read or listen to someone else read newspapers were likely to hear something about mourning standards from the pulpit. Sermons contemplating the importance of the royal death were preached around the country and in Ireland, quickly published, and distributed.<sup>89</sup> These sermons could be heard or read, and often sold for little more than a newspaper.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> An ad was run in the Classified section for such a collection commemorating the Duke of Gloucester's death. For instance, see *London Post with Intelligence Foreign and Domestic*, August 7-9, 1700.

<sup>89</sup> Preliminary research suggests that sermons on royal deaths were published within the same year that they were given, while there were often years between preaching and publishing dates of sermons on other topics.

<sup>90</sup> Not all sermons indicate their price. One example is Samuel Wright's 1727 sermon published in London that sold for four pence, while a copy of the *London Gazette* that same year cost three pence; Samuel Wright, *The Present General Mourning religiously improv'd: In a Sermon Preach'd at Black-Fryers on the Occasion of the Death of King George* (London, 1727). Jennifer Farooq notes that sermons typically cost between 2d and 6d during the early eighteenth century, in Eadem, "The Politicising Influence of Print: The Responses of Hearers and Readers to the Sermons of Gilbert Burnet and Henry Sacheverell," in *Readers, Audiences and Coteries in Early Modern England*, Geoff Baker and Ann McGruer, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2006), 37.

Whether preached or printed, sermons served multiple purposes. They were an opportunity to praise the royal family and the royal person, thus exhibiting loyalty and inspiring loyalty in the audience. It is difficult to know how the text changed between pulpit and press. Some, such as John Davy, helpfully made it clear that their sermon was altered before going to print.<sup>91</sup> It cannot be assumed that all authors made the distinction, so we must be cautious in assuming that the printed text was that heard by the congregation. Jennifer Farooq argues spoken and printed sermons served different functions. While the preacher's authority reigned in the church sermon, once printed, these texts could become politicized and debated.<sup>92</sup> One such example is John Piggott's *The Natural Frailty of Princes Consider'd*, given in March 1702 to commemorate William III's death. True to its title, Piggott's sermon begins with a lengthy exegesis on Psalm 146:3-4 (*Put not your trust in Princes, nor in the Son of Man, in whom there is no help*), during which Piggott maintains that one's trust should be in God, not princes, because princes are "subject to Change and Death; [and therefore] are no way fit for an Object of our absolute Trust."<sup>93</sup> This would seem an odd way to commemorate the death of a sovereign whom Piggott himself deems a "good prince". Piggott clarified his motivation by dedicating the printed sermon to Charles Mordaunt, third Earl of Peterborough. Though a whig who originally supported William's overthrow of James II in 1688/9, and afterwards served as a Gentleman of the Bedchamber in 1689, Mordaunt (Peterborough, at the time of Piggott's sermon) was in and

---

<sup>91</sup> John Davy, *Mourning and Morality Consider'd in a Sermon Occasion'd by the Death of His Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark Preach'd (and since Enlarg'd) at Croydon, in Surrey, November 21, 1708* (London, 1708).

<sup>92</sup> Farooq, "The Politicising Influence of Print."

<sup>93</sup> John Piggott, *The Natural Frailty of Princes Consider'd; In a Sermon Preach'd the 29th of March, 1702 Upon the Occasion of the Death of the late High and Mighty Prince William the Third, King of England, &c* (London, 1702), 9.

out of royal favor throughout his life. He even spent three months in the Tower in 1697.<sup>94</sup>

Piggott's sermon thus offers an example of a clergyman who sought to endear himself to a noble patron. Whether the rest of Piggott's congregation would have been aware of the political implications of this sermon is unclear.

On the whole, however, published sermons that commemorated a royal death erred on the side of panegyric. In 1702, the majority of sermons focused on praise of the monarch and the necessity of loyalty; even Piggott got around to it towards the conclusion of his diatribe. All sermons discussed here made at least fleeting mentions of the greatness of the deceased monarch, communal or individual duty to the crown, admonishment for sin, and the propriety of mourning.

During the first quarter of the eighteenth century, there was a distinct shift in ideas of proper mourning. While it was generally agreed that grief was the proper response to a royal death, there were disagreements among preachers between 1700 and 1727 about the appropriate intensity, focus, and justifications for this grief. Some sermons suggested different levels of mourning, based on the position of the deceased. According to Samuel Wright in 1727, there were five degrees of mourning. The first and most severe was reserved for the head of a family. The second was for "a publicly useful man."<sup>95</sup> The monarch would typically fall under one or both of these. There is also evidence that, though the degree was not specified in official orders for general mourning, these different levels of mourning were understood by the populace more

---

<sup>94</sup> "Mordaunt, Charles, third earl of Peterborough and first earl of Monmouth (1658?–1735)," John B. Hattendorf in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19162> (accessed January 25, 2013). Also *The Database of Court Officers 1660-1837*. Internet. Ed. R. O. Bucholz. December, 2005 (accessed January 25, 2013).

<sup>95</sup> Samuel Wright, *The present General Mourning religiously improv'd: In a Sermon Preach'd at Black-Fryers On the Occasion of the Death of the late King George* (London, 1727), 16-17.

generally. One newspaper reported that Queen Anne specifically ordered her servants to put themselves "into the strictest mourning, as for a father."<sup>96</sup>

Another common theme in sermons throughout the period was the levelling effect of death. Many preachers dwelt on it at length, while some mentioned it only briefly.<sup>97</sup> This theme could also be found outside the church. An Irish broadside containing an elegy on George I displayed a scene of the king on his deathbed across the top with images similar to the medieval *danse macabre* along the margins (Fig 1). Though the text of the broadside does not touch on this theme, the images of skeletons dancing with various officials (i.e., "Mayor," "Judge," "Physition") convey death's disregard for class or position.<sup>98</sup> Death's levelling role could be politicized as in the case of Piggott's 1702 sermon, or offer an opportunity for the preacher to remind the congregation and readers of their own imminent demise. The prevalence of this imagery also suggests that the monarch was considered, at least on some level, to be human, just like them.

Aside from reminding the congregation about their duty to the newly crowned king or queen, the most prominent objective in most preachers' sermons was to counsel their flock on moral action and comportment. In sermons commemorating royal deaths, this meant proper grief

---

<sup>96</sup> *Post Boy with Freshest Advices Foreign and Domestick*, October 30-November 2, 1708.

<sup>97</sup> For lengthier expositions see: John Davy, *Mourning and Morality Consider'd in a Sermon Occasion'd by the Death of His Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark Preach'd (and since Enlarg'd) at Croydon, in Surrey, November 21, 1708* (London, 1708); W. Fleetwood, *A Funeral Sermon on his late Royal Highness, the Duke of Gloucester, Preach'd Aug. the 4th, 1700, by W. Fleetwood, Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty* (London and Dublin, 1700).

<sup>98</sup> Anonymous, *Hibernia in Universal Mourning: Or, a Funeral Elegy on the Death of his most Sacred Majesty King George...* (Dublin, 1727). I have only been able to locate official broadsides containing speeches of ascending monarchs for the other royal deaths in this study. I have located one broadside containing a song for Mary II in 1695, and another, in French, displaying a poem and epitaph for George I. It is interesting to note that these broadsides, both displayed in London, contain no imagery. This could be for a number of reasons about which I can only speculate.



and mourning. Until 1714, the most common argument was that Christians should moderate their grief or sorrow. As discussed in Chapter two, overabundance of any emotion, especially grief, grew from self-love, because they could not be truly grieving for the dead who had gone to a better place. Too much grief was therefore indicative of focusing too much on their own desires, not on proper, Christian trust in God and his works. William Fleetwood, Chaplain in Ordinary to William III, warned against too much grief following the Duke of Gloucester's death, because grieving more for a child than anyone else showed "that we are govern'd more by our Affections, than our Reason," which would lead one to be weighed down by disappointments and question their trust in God.<sup>99</sup> In his 1708 sermon on the death of Prince George, John Davy reasoned that "Immoderate Love to our living Friends, as well as immoderate Sorrow for our dead ones, is not only sinful, but foolish...Grief will [need?] a Vent, and 'tis fit it should, but it must be moderated," because sorrow would not bring back the dead, and the living were not far behind them.<sup>100</sup> In 1704, William Ayloffe counselled for a similar caution, arguing that there are two kinds of sorrow: "when Sorrow is not extreme, she is ingenious, and Renders Man Eloquent without the benefit of Rhetorick...But when she is extreme, she stupifies, hardly leaving Man the use of any Sense."<sup>101</sup> Grief was therefore regarded by some as dangerous.

There is also evidence to suggest that broader affective norms were changing. In 1708, Francis Bragge, Vicar of Hitchin and Prebendary of Lincoln, opined that his *Practical treatise on the regulation of the passions* was out of fashion and not likely to be read by "Witts and Politicians." True to its title, Bragge's nearly 450-page treatise is a handbook on proper

---

<sup>99</sup> Fleetwood, 13-14.

<sup>100</sup> Davy, 19.

<sup>101</sup> William Ayloffe, *The Government of the Passions According to the Rules of Reason and Religion* (London, 1704), 125.

"Government of those Passions and Affections, whose Rebellion is the Cause of so much Misery to Mankind."<sup>102</sup> Nor was he alone in his opinions. Ayloffe had warned that the source of all criminal behavior was "when our Passions rebel against our Reason."<sup>103</sup> Bragge, nevertheless, recognized that this philosophy was falling out of fashion.

Most of the published sermons written for William's death in 1702 focus on the loss of the king's military leadership of the nation. This is understandable, as William was head of the war effort against France. These sermons mention grief, but did not dwell upon it. When these cautious clergymen did broach the subject, they counselled it must be controlled and only proper when justified. William Bentley described an emotional *via media* as the proper goal of "Men and Christians": "least we should be swallow'd up of overmuch Sorrow our Afflictions are always sweetned [sic] with some comfortable Considerations, and our Blessings mixed with some melancholy Reflections, to prevent our Conceited and Ambitious Exaltations."<sup>104</sup> Richard Allen included a note to the reader as a preface to his published sermon, which reminded readers of the beatitude, *blessed are they that mourn*, clarifying it "must not be understood of all kinds of Mourning and Sorrow, but of such (whether occasion'd by Sin or Suffering) as is of a Godly Sort."<sup>105</sup> Allen thus followed the beliefs of many clergymen at the time in thinking that mourning must be properly focused and perform religious work.

---

<sup>102</sup> Francis Bragge, *A practical treatise of the regulation of the passions* (London, 1708), not paginated (A2/3).

<sup>103</sup> Ayloffe, 8.

<sup>104</sup> William Bentley, *A Sermon, Occasionally Preached on the Funeral of our late Sovereign William the III, King of England Scotland, France, and Ireland; Who was Solemnly Interr'd in Henry the 7th Chappel in the Abby of Westminster, on Sunday April the 12, 1702* (London, 1702), 4. The term *via media* is discussed in Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

<sup>105</sup> Richard Allen, *The Death of a Good King, a Great Publick Loss; Exemplified in a Sermon Preached March 29th 1701(2), upon the Much Lamented Death of Our Late Sovereign William III of Glorious Memory* (London, 1702), A2.

In general, the way to mourn the king properly was to contemplate his value to the nation, "in order to justify our Sorrow."<sup>106</sup> Allen used a considerable number of pages to explicate the proper forms of mourning. Like other sermons in 1702, Allen's emphasized William's greatness and the nation's loss of a leader. This justified sorrow, but readers were reminded that they had reason to "rejoice in [their] Mourning," because, while they had lost a king, they had gained a queen, which, Allen chided, should give them hope.<sup>107</sup>

Twelve years later, a slightly less severe approach to mourning was espoused from the pulpit. Joseph Smith asserted that "affectionate Expressions of Sorrow and Mourning" were one category of remembrance owed to the "Righteous Departed." However, Christians should not "indulge in Excesses of Grief, yet the Moderate and Decent Expressions of it are, and have always been, esteem'd."<sup>108</sup> According to Nathaniel Marshall, the hardest part of a subject's duties to a deceased monarch was "to carry a steady Hand between Condolences and Gratulations."<sup>109</sup> There was, however, a greater emphasis on the necessity to mourn than in 1702. Smith warned against the "Excess and Superstition" of "Heathen" obsequies, but that "the tender Passion of Grief is never discountenanc'd on this Occasion," because Jesus himself wept.<sup>110</sup> It was fear of

---

<sup>106</sup> Bentley, 5.

<sup>107</sup> Allen, 18-24.

<sup>108</sup> Joseph Smith, *The duty of the living to the memory of the dead. A sermon upon the death of Her most sacred Majesty Queen Anne. Preached at Russel-Court and Trinity Chapels, Aug 8, 1714* (London, 1714), 6, 8.

<sup>109</sup> Nathaniel Marshall, *The Royal Pattern: Or, A Sermon upon the Death of Her Late Excellent Majesty Queen Anne, Preach'd in the Parish-Church of Finchlet in the County of Middlesex, upon Sunday August the 8th, 1714.* (London, 1714).

<sup>110</sup> Smith, 9. Cites John 11:35, *Jesus wept.*

popish extremes, Smith argued, that had led people to err on the side of too much restraint in mourning and honoring the dead properly.<sup>111</sup>

As both court and public embraced emotions more openly, grief became more important in commemorating royal deaths. In the late seventeenth century, clergymen had argued that excess grief was unreasonable. Sermons given on the occasion of George I's death in 1727 directly rebuked this line of thinking. Samuel Wright argued that "there is Reason enough to put on sorrowful Dress, when great and good Men especially good Kings, are taken from this Earth;" but warned that if such mourning was "*mere pageantry*," that God would "bring Calamities more nearly and pressingly" upon the nation.<sup>112</sup>

This new emphasis on grieving *enough* was taken to new heights in the press. The ever-instructive *London Journal* dedicated the front pages of (at least) two issues to the topic of George I's death. The first contained instructions on proper mourning for the dead king, and was filled with relatively dramatic language on the author's own feelings:

The ordinary Consolations of Reason and Philosophy are ineffectual to chastise the first Transports of Grief in a pious people, mourning for their King and Father. All that we can think, and speak, and write is too little to express the Passion in the Soul; and Extravagance it self does not mean half enough.

The author conceded that he should be comforted by "Submission to the Divine Will", as preachers often counselled. However, acknowledging that in its grief his heart had "grown willful to its own Afflicion, and refuses Comfort," he begged the reader to "indulge the Passion of an honest Mind, which delights to linger on the melancholy Scene, and mingle his Afflicion

---

<sup>111</sup> Smith, 10.

<sup>112</sup> Wright, 22. Italics in original.

with that of a whole People," before embarking on a lengthy panegyric on the dead king.<sup>113</sup> As dialogues between monarchs and their elite subjects became more focused on grieving a monarch's death, so did conduct literature. The model of a grieving monarch further promoted the embrace of mourning through sorrow.

#### VI. "A woman of sorrowful spirit"

When a member of the royal family died, the monarch's response was closely watched and reported in both the press, in diaries, and used as fodder for sermons. They were promoted as models of behavior from the pulpit and popular advice columns. While William was described as a "Master of himself by the Command he had over his Passions," Anne was praised as *a woman of sorrowful spirit*.<sup>114</sup>

Gilbert Burnet observed that during the illness of her last surviving son, William Duke of Gloucester, Princess Anne attended him "with great tenderness, but with a grave composedness, that amazed all who saw it: She bore his death with a Resignation and Piety that were indeed very singular."<sup>115</sup> Anne's stoicism at her son's sickbed did not last long. After a short illness, the Duke died on August 1, at which event, Luttrell reported that Anne was "much indisposed."<sup>116</sup> A week later on August 8, she remained at Windsor where she spent time in the garden to "divert her melancholy thoughts."<sup>117</sup>

Anne was praised for her composure and stoicism while tending to her son's deathbed. At the death of her husband, however, focus shifted to concern over the effect grief would have on

---

<sup>113</sup> *London Journal*, June 17, 1727.

<sup>114</sup> *Post Boy*, March 7 - March 10, 1701/2.

<sup>115</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *History of my Own Time* vol. 2 (London, 1724-25), 246.

<sup>116</sup> Luttrell, vol. 4, 672.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid*, 675.

her ability to do her job. As queen, of course, her actions carried heavier consequences than as princess. Following George's death, Marlborough and Godolphin expressed concern in their correspondence over her inability to give an important speech.<sup>118</sup> Others printed their speculations about whether grief would interfere with the queen's duties.

*The Observer* printed a brief dialogue between its editor and the "Country-Man," a thinly-veiled device to allow the author to expound on the topics that suited him. The author declared the subject a "melancholy" one, but counselled his readers to take comfort in God's government of worldly affairs. He told them that they had "Reason to hope, that the Goodness of God, who has made her Majesty to triumph so frequently over her own, and *Europe's* Enemies, will not suffer her to fall under her Grief," and reminded them that many prayed "for her Majesty's Support under this Heavy Affliction."<sup>119</sup>

Her grief was expected to be intense and real, because her love for her husband had been so. The marriage of George and Anne was presented as an ideal union. They loved each other truly and, it was reported, they both remained faithful and dutiful to the one another. In 1708, *The Observer* lauded the Prince's "Just Return of Conjugal Affection, so rare among Princes."<sup>120</sup> Likewise, in his funeral sermon for Anne's death, Samuel Charlton lauded Anne's "Conjugal Love and Fidelity," and held her up as an example to be followed:

If women of great Birth and Quality would imitate and make Her their Copy, be as affectionate, just, and faithful to the Marriage-Bed as She was, we should not so frequently hear of Separation of Houses, Tables, Beds, and so many impure and

---

<sup>118</sup> H. L. Snyder, ed, *Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence* vol. 2 (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 1145.

<sup>119</sup> *Observer*, Oct. 27-30, 1708.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.* See chapter five for in-depth discussion of the affective expectations of royal spouses.

irreligious Cohabitations, to the great Displeasure of Almighty God, and to the Shame and Discredit of Christianity.<sup>121</sup>

Anne was a model woman. She was the nation's "nursing mother", and, being dutiful to her husband and country, she overtaxed her own body to give the nation an heir.<sup>122</sup> At this, she failed again and again.

Anne thus came to be a *woman of sorrowful spirit*. This verse (1 Samuel 1:15) was frequently invoked in descriptions of the queen projected from the pulpit. When her husband died, Davy divided mourners into two types, those who mourn sincerely or who are *of sorrowful spirit*, and those who mourn for show. Anne fell into the first category, because "the Troubles of her Heart [were] enlarg'd...under the heavy Loss of so dear...a Consort."<sup>123</sup> In a sermon commemorating her own death, Samuel Charlton admitted that, despite her unwavering piety, the queen "was often afflicted with a devout Sorrow," and that she was, "justly" a *woman of sorrowful spirit*.<sup>124</sup> Newspapers and sermons praised Anne's piety, but they could not deny the hardships of her life that caused her real sorrow. Nathaniel Marshall even suggested it was her sympathy for her people that created her "Agonies and Torments."<sup>125</sup>

Following his death, King George I was also described as being emotionally invested in his country. Wright declared: "His Paternal Affection and Concern for the good of his People

---

<sup>121</sup> It is worth noting that this sermon was preached at both Oxford and St. James' on the same day. Samuel Charlton, *Great-Britain's grief: set forth in a funeral sermon, occasionally preach'd on Sunday, August 29, 1714. In the University of Oxford, On the much lamented Death of Her Majesty Queen Anne* (London, 1714), 16. The same sermon was also published as Idem, *Great-Britain's grief: set forth in a funeral sermon, occasionally preach'd on Sunday, August 29, 1714 in the Chapel-Royal at St. James's, On the much lamented Death of her Majesty Queen Anne* (London 1714).

<sup>122</sup> See Bucholz, "Nothing But Ceremony'."

<sup>123</sup> Davy, 15.

<sup>124</sup> Charlton, 4.

<sup>125</sup> Marshall, 18.

could not be read or told without the most pleasing Tenderness."<sup>126</sup> George was not often described as mourning Anne's death, but, considering the persistent concern with sincerity prevalent in sermons and even in some serials, this is not surprising. He had little contact with Anne. Any expression of overt sorrow would smack of insincerity.

George II, however, grieved openly and publicly for his father. William had been lauded as a stoic, but Anne was genuinely a *woman of sorrowful spirit*. This suggests that the general suspicion and distrust of grief had dissipated. William was the *father of the nation*, while Anne was the nation's *nursing mother*. George I was repeatedly described as having "Paternal Affection" for his country and people. As one was expected to feel sorrow for a parent, the public was expected to mourn for their sovereign. Grief became a proper emotion for both sovereign and subject.

#### V. Grieving Sensibly

Between 1694 and 1727, the printed dialogue reveals a shift in approaches to grief: from anxiety over its dangerous effects to concern about its inadequacy. Though contemporary observers and historians, alike, acknowledged William's grief over his wife's sudden death, his subjects' cautions against grieving too much suggest that grief was considered dangerous. This notion was also echoed in printed sermons and other normative literature of the early eighteenth century.<sup>127</sup> While sermons counselled against too much grief because it was evidence of a focus on earthly existence, the Members of Parliament urged William to take care because the welfare

---

<sup>126</sup> Wright, 20.

<sup>127</sup> See n. 20 above.



of both England and Europe depended on him.<sup>128</sup> These addresses are unique in their warnings about the dangers of grief. Even though Anne was equally distraught by the death of her husband, Prince George in 1708, no addresses or warnings were printed following his death.<sup>129</sup> By 1727, warnings about the dangers of grief had completely disappeared from addresses printed in newspapers.

This shift in attitudes is also reflected in the changing justifications of this grief. In 1702 and 1714, the London officials thought it necessary to point out the justification of their emotion. They were "sensibly affected" in 1702, and their "Concern and Sorrow" was "just" in 1714. They could not conceal their mourning for George I, however, because they were 'too sensibly affect[ed]'. This points to a change, not only in the level, but the type of affect expressed. In this case, the word "sensible," which was very commonly used throughout the period, has two different meanings. In 1702, the usage points to a justified or reasonable affect; while in 1727, they specified that they could not conceal their grief because it "sensibly" affected them, which suggests a physical aspect of their grief. Whether the grief expressed was reasonable or of a physical sort, the accession of the new monarch was always offered as a palliative, suggesting the influence of some contemporary physicians and philosophers who insisted that grief must be moderated by opposing passions.<sup>130</sup> As the expression of grief grew in intensity, so did its cure.

---

<sup>128</sup> *LG*, December 27-31, 1694. The House of Peers reminded William that it was on his life that 'the Welfare and Happiness of the Kingdom, and the Liberties of Europe' depended.

<sup>129</sup> Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, 220-21.

<sup>130</sup> Stephen Pender, "Rhetoric, Grief, and Imagination in Early Modern England," *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 43 (2010), 54-85.

These expressions show a shift from restrained, justified (reasonable) grief, to physically affecting, uncontrollable grief, often seen as characteristic of the culture of sensibility.<sup>131</sup>

The term "sensibility" remains elusive for both contemporaries and historians, but it is most often seen as a literary movement that promoted "a widespread expression of the more refined kind of suffering," which increasingly separated the middle classes from the real, human suffering of the poor.<sup>132</sup> As sensibility gained cultural salience it became deeply tied to notions of civility and politeness in England that separated the upper social classes from the "lower sort."<sup>133</sup> Though most studies focus on the origins of sensibility only as the lineage behind the novels of Jane Austen or the diatribes of Mary Wollstonecraft, the first hints of a culture of sensibility are detectable in the politics of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.<sup>134</sup> Many argue that it originated in the writings and popularity of the third Earl of Shaftesbury. In 1711, Shaftesbury published *Characteristics*, which promoted the propriety of the expression of emotions, or "the man of feeling," in the political sphere.<sup>135</sup> Shaftesbury's goal was a more

---

<sup>131</sup> Paul Friedland (*Seeing Justice Done: The Age of Spectacular Capital Punishment in France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 143–64) has recently observed a similar shift from a neo-stoic emphasis on reason to an increased importance of human compassion, or *sensibilité* in early eighteenth-century France.

<sup>132</sup> G. J. Barker-Benfield, "Sensibility," in *An Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age: British Culture 1776–1832*, ed. Iain McCalman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 102.

<sup>133</sup> Paul Goring, *The Rhetoric of Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); G. J. Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

<sup>134</sup> Some studies have suggested earlier origins. See, for instance, R. S. Crane, "Suggestions Toward a Genealogy of the 'Man of Feeling,'" *ELH*, 1.3 (1934), 205–30. Crane's thesis was directly challenged by, among others, Donald Greene, "Latitudinarianism and Sensibility: The Genealogy of the 'Man of Feeling' Reconsidered," *Modern Philology*, 75 (1977), 159–83.

<sup>135</sup> Cecil A. Moore, *Backgrounds of English Literature 1700–1760* (New York: Octagon Books, 1969), Ch. 1, "Shaftesbury and the Ethical Poets in England," 3–52; Chester Chapin, "Shaftesbury and the Man of Feeling," *Modern Philology*, 81 (1983), 47–50; Lawrence Eliot Klein, "Introduction," in Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of Shaftesbury, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, ed. Klein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), vii–xxxi (xix).

civilised approach to political rhetoric that would quell the heated rivalries between Whigs and Tories.

It was also during this time that Societies for the Reformation of Manners sought to change social behaviours at every level of society. Laws prohibiting profanity and drunkenness enacted by William III and Anne further supported these endeavours. Though the court was not the only source of these efforts, the Reformation of Manners was largely a top-down movement. This politically oriented politeness gained a broader audience with the appearance of such publications as *The Tatler* (1709–11) and *The Spectator* (1711–12, 1714), dedicated to discussions of proper sociability and behaviour, by editors Joseph Addison and Richard Steele.<sup>136</sup> Mark Knights argues printed addresses, such as those discussed above, also "contributed towards growing sentiments about nationality and politeness" and that through the act of addressing "the boroughs spoke and absorbed the language of civility."<sup>137</sup> Printed addresses should be seen as an element in broader efforts to promote the behaviour of polite society. The language of politeness and civility included emotional expression often associated with later eighteenth-century sensibility.

The rise in affective rhetoric in the dialogue that followed a royal death and accession thus suggests that such expression came to be expected of those in the highest levels of the political sphere. As the printed dialogue served to raise public opinion in favour of the monarch, it follows that monarchs portrayed themselves in ways that would endear themselves to their

---

<sup>136</sup> Andrew Lincoln, 'War and the Culture of Politeness: The Case of the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 36.2 (2012), 60–79. Many scholars cite Addison and Steele as proponents of the same sense of politeness advocated by Shaftesbury, but more recent scholarship suggests that they diverged somewhat. See Joseph Chaves, 'Strangers and Publics: Social and Textual Circulation in *The Spectator*', *Media History*, 14.3 (2008), 293–308.

<sup>137</sup> Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, 150, 152.

subjects, especially those with political clout. Acting according to the dictates of polite civility helped to prove their worthiness to rule in the absence of claims to divine right. Monarchs needed to portray themselves as the head of the government (even if real political power was shifting), and part of this was proving their elevated place in the culture of polite civility. In the male-dominated political sphere, it became ever more important to act as a ‘man of feeling’.<sup>138</sup>

This dialogue thus served multiple purposes. On a fundamental level, the participants in this exchange each received some potential benefit from the *quid pro quo* of loyalty and favour. The fact that these exchanges were printed for a wider audience, however, suggests that they served a more instructive function. Readers who sought to imitate the upper classes in their pursuit of a higher place in society were able to observe the expressions used by both monarchs and politicians. Loyal addresses to some extent mirrored the monarch’s affect, which presented the monarch as a model of comportment. In this case, it suggested to a wider audience that they too should mourn the royal death.

Mourning language became a more prominent, and more verbose, part of the political exchange that promoted increased emotional expression among the greater public. In 1694–95, politicians warned William against grieving too much lest it hinder his ability to be an effective king. Anne was a *woman of sorrowful spirit*. She grieved properly and genuinely for her son and husband, and advice in sermons shifted towards an emphasis on sincerity in mourning. It changed the conversation from *whether* one should grieve, to the type of grief one should feel. At George II’s accession in 1727, the new king was praised for expressing grief over his father, and

---

<sup>138</sup> Though Henry Mackenzie did not publish his novel, *The Man of Feeling*, until 1771, it is apparent that ideas and forms that became popular in the earlier part of the century influenced him. See Julie Ellison, *Cato’s Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999); Jennifer C. Vaught, *Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern English Literature* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

the public was urged to imitate him. The likelihood that William's grief was more sincere than George's is beyond the scope of historical inquiry and had little impact on the form that print took for public instruction. Instead, affective rhetoric was part of the progression of the culture of sensibility. In 1694, grief was to be subdued; thirty years later, it had become the proper affective comportment of the highest members of society.

In essence, the dialogue and the mourning standards it promoted were a form of instructive propaganda. Expressing sorrow over a royal death was part of the ideal relationship to the monarch. If cultivated effectively, proper emotional comportment could result in royal notice or favour, both potentially very helpful to a politician's career. Those outside of the political sphere (or those of the middling sort) sought to mimic the polite gentility of the upper classes in order to separate themselves from the rough, lower sort. When looking for a model of self-expression that would prove oneself superior to the 'rougher sort', who better to imitate than a king?<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Portions of this chapter were published in: Amy B. Oberlin, "'Share with me in my Grief and Affliction': Royal Sorrow and Public Mourning in Early Eighteenth-Century England," *Parergon* 31:2 (December 2014): 99-120.

Fig. 1. *Hibernia in Universal Mourning* (Dublin, 1727)

## CHAPTER FOUR

### "A KIND OF MARRIAGE DAY": ACCESSION, CORONATION AND AFFECTIVE UNITY

A monarch's death marked the end of one reign and the beginning of the next. Upon accession, a new king or queen set to building a relationship with their subjects. This relationship was at the heart of the national political order and was dictated by both law and custom. In 1765, legal commentator William Blackstone defined the British constitution as, at its core, the outline of the reciprocal duties of protection and subjection between monarch and subject.<sup>1</sup> Just as subjects were bound through oaths of allegiance to be obedient to and protective of their monarch, the monarch was likewise bound by the coronation oath to protect the British people.<sup>2</sup> Though the monarch's duty to his or her people was "impliedly as much incumbent on the sovereign before the coronation as after," Blackstone concluded that the terms of the contract between sovereign and subject were "couched in the coronation oath."<sup>3</sup> Thus, though most reigns began at the death of the predecessor, the coronation ceremony was, in the words of one minister, "a kind of *Marriage Day* between the Prince and the People."<sup>4</sup> It represented the reciprocal bonds between sovereign and subject, and through its symbolism, solidified them.

---

<sup>1</sup> William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol. 1 (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1765), 226.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 227.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 229, 227-28. Blackstone was not clear on what he meant by "couched in the coronation oath." He argued that in 1688, the coronation oath was clarified and solidified to avoid any doubts raised by "weak and scrupulous minds." (Ibid, 226)

<sup>4</sup> J. Mauduit, *A Sermon on the Coronation of Her Most Excellent Majesty Queen Anne. Preached on the Frisay-Lecture at the Queen's Weigh-House, in East-Cheap. April 24, 1702* (London, 1702), 16.

Accession celebrations began almost immediately upon a predecessor's death (or in William and Mary's case, after Parliamentary consensus) and ran concurrent with the public mourning discussed in the previous chapter. The new king or queen was proclaimed immediately and a coronation was planned following an appropriate period of mourning for the previous monarch. The coronation always took place after the funeral. According to Jennifer Woodward, in the early seventeenth century, it was traditional for the new king to make no appearances in London until his predecessor was buried.<sup>5</sup> This was less taboo after the Restoration, likely because Charles II set the new precedent in 1660, when he ascended a vacant throne and thus had no (immediate) predecessor to mourn. Later Stuarts and Hanoverians received addresses, appeared before Parliament and addressed their people before their predecessor had been laid to rest. Traditionally, the coronation was the most public royal ceremony; it emphasized the continuity of royal power while solidifying the relationship between the people and their new sovereign. The coronation oath legally bound the monarch to uphold the laws and thus obligated the sovereign to act as protector of his or subjects. It was simultaneously a moment of public celebration. In the decades after 1689, public celebrations became more focused on the individual's relationship to the monarch.

In the twentieth century, British coronations elicited numerous publications ranging from magazine special issues and pamphlets to lengthy commemorative and academic publications. The range of texts suggests that publishers and authors saw these coronations as opportunities for profit and glorification of the nation. Publishers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries enacted similar plans with often similar content. Coronations of the later seventeenth century

---

<sup>5</sup> Jennifer Woodward, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570-1625* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1997), 100. Woodward points to James I's absence from London prior to Elizabeth I's funeral.



inspired historians to write (or re-publish) treatises on the history of monarchy and the coronation ceremony itself and poets to pen lengthy panegyrics to the monarch and the institution of monarchy, itself. However, one major difference between the commemorative publications in the late seventeenth century and those in the twentieth century is the focus on the personal life of the monarch. Much attention has been given to Elizabeth II's coronation in 1953 as the first ever televised, but little has been said on the effects that the explosion of print had on the rite in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Those volumes that do cover early modern coronations gloss over or completely fail to mention the coronations of the later Stuarts and early Hanoverians. In doing so, they overlook a tumultuous period for the monarchy in which its very nature was called into question. Indeed, it was during this period that the form of the coronation changed in important, if subtle ways. Coronation entries ceased, but scaffolding was erected outside of Westminster Abbey for spectators to witness a short but grand procession. The most important part - and one element rarely ignored by scholars - was the alteration of the coronation oath in 1689. The most important changes in accession celebrations, including the coronation took place outside the walls of Westminster Abbey.

### I. Becoming Sovereign

Britain's monarchy is primarily a hereditary one. The crown passes automatically to the heir upon the death of a monarch. The heir is determined by a detailed scheme of precedence. However, according to eighteenth-century legal commentator, William Blackstone, the crown was "subject to limitations by parliament."<sup>6</sup> Should the hereditary line fail or the throne be

---

<sup>6</sup> William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol. 1 (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1765), 203.

vacated willingly through abdication, the power to choose the successor fell to Parliament.<sup>7</sup> A vacant throne hypothetically opened the most powerful seat in government open to incursion. More pressingly, it left the nation without a head. To preserve the tranquility of the realm, proclamations were made as soon as possible to declare the new monarch to the public. The initial proclamation was an important event, marked in cities and towns around the country. Hannah Smith notes that events surrounding the accession "were endowed with a greater weight than other civic occasions, owing to their regal nature." Civic dignitaries in London and beyond sought places in local proclaiming and coronation processions.<sup>8</sup>

According to Blackstone, the first time the throne was vacated was upon James II's effectual abdication in 1688.<sup>9</sup> James' son-in-law, William and his Dutch army arrived in England in November 1688 and by the end of December, James saw an escape to the continent as his only option.<sup>10</sup> He departed England for France on December 10. It was not until February that both Houses of Parliament agreed that the throne was vacant, after several conferences on the subject.<sup>11</sup> According to Roy Strong, Parliament concluded that James had violated his coronation oath and thus abdicated his throne.<sup>12</sup> On February 13, Parliament signed an act placing William

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 207.

<sup>8</sup> Hannah Smith, *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714-1760* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 156.

<sup>9</sup> William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol. 1 (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1765), 204.

<sup>10</sup> John Miller, *James II* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000, originally published in 1978), 200-205.

<sup>11</sup> Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714* Vol. 2 (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1857), 500.

<sup>12</sup> Roy Strong, *Coronation: A History of Kingship and the British Monarchy* (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 2005), 284.

and Mary on the throne. The Houses of Parliament then travelled, reportedly en masse, to Whitehall where William and Mary accepted the offer of the throne.<sup>13</sup>

Luttrell reports that, "immediately" after William and Mary accepted the throne, the heralds, "with the lords and commons [sic] went and proclaimed their Majesties at Whitehall gate."<sup>14</sup> They were proclaimed in a ceremony that was based on precedent to assure the nation of the continuity of royal authority. However, because William and Mary were put on the throne by Parliament, their accession to some degree required popular support. In 1685, James was declared king by the Privy Council; but in 1688/9, both Houses of Parliament - including Commons - were present when William and Mary accepted the crown.<sup>15</sup> The *Gazette* reported James was proclaimed "with the usual Solemnity," followed by the actual proclamation signed by the Privy Council.<sup>16</sup> In 1688/9, the proclamation itself was not included in the paper, in its place the *Gazette* printed a detailed description of the procession, focused on the participation of the crowds.

The large proclamation procession, including both Houses of Parliament, was first met at Whitehall gate by "Multitudes of People there Assembled," who responded with "repeated Acclamations of Joy."<sup>17</sup> The *Gazette's* account detailed that, at every stop along the procession route, the proclamation was "echoed with Universal Acclamations of Joy by the Multitudes of

---

<sup>13</sup> Luttrell, Vol. 2, 501. These proceedings, starting with Parliament's decision to put William and Mary on the throne, were reported in another London newspaper. However, the timeline is different from every other account, reporting that Mary was not present when they offered the throne to William. *The London Mercury or Moderate Intelligencer*, February 11-14, 1688/9.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Luttrell Vol. 2, 501; *LG*, February 11-14, 1688/9.

<sup>16</sup> *LG*, February 5-9, 1684/5.

<sup>17</sup> *The London Gazette*, February 11-14, 1688/9, 2.

People which crowded the Streets, Windows and Balconies."<sup>18</sup> The crowd's reaction illustrated the support for Parliament's decision, as well as approval of the new monarchs. The diarist John Evelyn noted that William and Mary were proclaimed "with greate acclimation and generall good reception;" though, he wondered that "it was believ'd that both, especially the Princess, would have shew'd some (seeming) reluctance at least of assuming her father's Crown." Despite these murmurs, Mary offered no apology, but entered Whitehall, "laughing and jolly as to a wedding."<sup>19</sup> The court-controlled *Gazette* did not comment on the new queen's glee upon the occasion.

The announcement of Anne's accession in March 1701/2 included fewer details of the proclamation procession and the crowd's reactions. It was announced in the press alongside news of William's death, following the same format as the announcement of her father's accession in 1685. Rather than focusing on the proclamation ceremony, which was conducted "with the usual Solemnity," the newspaper printed the proclamation and its signatories.<sup>20</sup> The 1701/2 proclamation contained the same wording as the 1684/5 proclamation, with minor changes such as gender pronouns, declaring the government's support of the new queen "with all hearty and humble Affection."<sup>21</sup> Whereas the announcement of William and Mary's accession (or appointment) to the throne had focused on the public's response, Anne's accession was announced following earlier precedent. The circumstances were, of course, quite different. Anne succeeded to the throne as rightful heir in a predetermined hereditary succession, while William

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> William Bray, ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn, Esq., F.R.S., from 1641 to 1705/6*, (London: Gibbings and Co. Ltd., 1895; reprint, Forgotten Books, 2012), 529.

<sup>20</sup> *LG*, March 5-9, 1701/2.

<sup>21</sup> *LG*, February 5-9, 1684/5; March 5-9, 1701/2.

and Mary had been declared king and queen by act of Parliament. In 1688/9, the country had been on the brink of revolution. The court emphasized the public outpouring of support because it was to some extent a requisite for the accession and to maintain a peace. Anne's succession was far less tenuous. Though her place in the line of succession had been solidified by Parliament in 1688/9, she ascended the throne as rightful, hereditary heir.

In 1714, George I was "proclaim'd with the usual solemnity before the Gate of His Palace at St. James's, at Charing-Cross, at Temple-Bar, at the End of Woodstreet in Cheapside, and lastly at the Royal Exchange."<sup>22</sup> As in Anne's reign, "Great Numbers of the Nobility and Principal Gentry assisted at each Proclamation, and attended in their Coaches during the whole Solemnity."<sup>23</sup> Again following precedent, the announcement included the verbatim proclamation, which declared the new king "with one full Voice, with Consent of Tongue and Heart."<sup>24</sup> The main difference in the 1714 proclamation was that it included a list of those officials who would oversee the administration of government until the king arrived in England. George's succession had been determined by a 1701 act of Parliament, but some opposition remained.<sup>25</sup> To help smooth the transition, the *Gazette* attempted to create the appearance of business as usual.

In light of popular opposition to the Hanoverian succession, other newspapers laid out George's claim to the throne as a defense of his accession. The *British Mercury* provided an account of George's lineage, which illustrated his familial claim to the throne.<sup>26</sup> The newspaper,

---

<sup>22</sup> *LG*, July 31 - August 3, 1714.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> See especially, Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 161-194.

<sup>26</sup> *British Mercury*, July 28-August 4, 1714.

*Patriot* published the text of the 1705/6 *Act for the better securing of Her Majesties Person and Government, and of the Succession to the Crown of England in the Protestant Line*, that made it high treason to refuse to take the oath to the new Protestant King.<sup>27</sup> A more detailed account of the proclamation ceremony was published in *The Flying Post or The Post Master*, which reported that, during the proclamation, "the Streets being crowded with People, who made joyful Acclamations."<sup>28</sup> This account was echoed by Sarah Cowper, who also saw fit to write an oath of her own in her diary: "The High Mighty Prince Georg [e]t;C. By the Grace of God, King of Great Brittain[sic] [e]t;C. To whom wee Do Acknowledge a Faith and Constant Obedience, with all Hearty and Humble Affection. Beseeching God by Whom Kings and Queens Do Reign, to Bless the Royal King Georg with Long and Happy Years to Reign over Us."<sup>29</sup> Perhaps Lady Cowper thought it best to take her own oath so as to not appear disloyal to posterity; but this may have been a sort of personal oath, given in private out of either feelings of obligation or sincere affection for the monarchy.

In June 1727, when George's son ascended the throne as King George II, the *Gazette* gave a slightly more detailed account of the proclamation. The one new detail was that the Officers of Arms were on foot for the proclamation at Leicester House, before mounting their horses to proceed to Leicester Square, Charing Cross, Temple Bar, Woodstreet and the Royal Exchange with "the usual solemnities."<sup>30</sup> The court also published a broadside that included the

---

<sup>27</sup> *Patriot*, July 31 - August 3, 1714.

<sup>28</sup> *The Flying Post or The Post Master*, July 31 - August 3, 1714.

<sup>29</sup> Sarah Cowper, *The Diary of Sarah, Lady Cowper*, ed. Anne Kluger (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), 236.

<sup>30</sup> *LG*, June 13-17, 1727.

official proclamation, oath and list of the government ministers who signed it.<sup>31</sup> Other papers provided additional details, primarily signaling the urgency with which the new king was informed and proclaimed. The *Daily Post* reported that Sir Robert Walpole rode to Richmond himself to inform the Prince of Wales of his father's death. The following day, George II "ascend(ed) the Throne of his Father with universal Acclamation."<sup>32</sup>

Within a few days of being proclaimed, the new monarch addressed his or her subjects for the first time. This message was published in newspapers and broadsides. William and Mary's first proclamation, published on February 18, 1688/9, was a short paragraph in the *Gazette* that assured their subjects they sought to "prevent any Inconvenience," and to smooth the transition of power, told Protestants to remain in their offices.<sup>33</sup> Anne was first presented to her people as queen in printed speeches to the Houses of Lords and Commons. Georg Ludwig resided in Hanover when he ascended the throne, on August 1, 1714. He did not arrive in England until September 21. As he could not give the customary speech to his council and parliament, he wrote a letter to the Lord Chancellor, who recounted the letter in a speech to both houses of Parliament on August 13, 1714. It was this speech that gave the public its first contact with their new monarch. The Lord Chancellor assured George's subjects that the new king was "hastening hither, to employ His utmost Care for putting these Kingdoms into a happy and flourishing condition." The letter further expressed George's "great Satisfaction in the Loyalty and Affection which His People have universally shewn upon His Majesty's Accession to the

---

<sup>31</sup> *Whereas It Hath Pleased Almighty God to Call to His Mercy Our Late Sovereign Lord King George* (London, 1727).

<sup>32</sup> *Daily Post*, June 15, 1727.

<sup>33</sup> *LG*, February 14-18, 1688/9.

Crown."<sup>34</sup> George II's first publication as king was a speech given to his Privy Council at Leicester House.

As discussed in the previous chapter, these initial presentations vary in character, form and length, but they each displayed the monarch's attention to his or her duty and they all appeal to the "affection" of their people. William and Mary's brief announcement asked that government officers and administrators remain in the posts and that "all Our Loving Subjects" obey said officers to keep the government running smoothly.<sup>35</sup> Anne's first speech to her Privy Council contained no mention of the loyalty of her subjects, but her speech to Parliament, published in the following issue of the *Gazette*, requested the "Fidelity and Affection" of her audience to help her protect English religion and liberty.<sup>36</sup> George I's letter expressed his "great Satisfaction in the Loyalty and Affection which his People have universally shewn" upon his accession.<sup>37</sup> His son was the most effusive of his own feelings, declaring his "Love and Affection" for his people.<sup>38</sup> All of these references show that "affection" and "love" were equated with loyalty. This language was not new to this period, but both monarchs and their subjects used emotive language increasingly throughout the period.

Though most of these speeches were given to a particular, elite audience, they were disseminated to the broader public through print. As was discussed in the previous chapter, the language used in these speeches was frequently repeated both by their subjects in addresses to

---

<sup>34</sup> *LG*, August 10-14, 1714.

<sup>35</sup> *LG*, February 14-18, 1688/9.

<sup>36</sup> *LG*, March 9-12, 1701/2.

<sup>37</sup> *LG*, August 10-14, 1714.

<sup>38</sup> *LG*, June 13-17, 1727.



the monarch. The most famous line in Anne's speech was, and remains, "I know My own Heart to be entirely English." Historians see this as either a reference to William's foreign birth or an allusion to a famous line by Queen Elizabeth I.<sup>39</sup> Her contemporaries interpreted it in different ways, but it clearly made an impression on her subjects. This line in particular was echoed in loyal addresses to the queen. For instance, the officials of the County of Cambridge asked for leave to express the "unfeigned thanks of true *English* Hearts."<sup>40</sup> George II's most echoed line cannot but have been a reference to his father: "my Love and Affection to this Country, from my Knowledge and Experience of you, makes me resolve chearfully to undergo all Difficulties for the Sake and Good of my People." George II's subjects thanked providence for providing a king whose "Love and Affection to Britain we have such Knowledge and Experience."<sup>41</sup> When George I came to the throne, he had never lived in England, nor had he spent much time there. Even his knowledge of the English language has been contested.<sup>42</sup> By the time George II ascended the throne in 1727, he had lived in England for over a decade. This line in George II's speech was likely a commentary on his father's foreign origins.

## II. Public Response: Addressing and the Language of Loyalty

After the publication of the first royal speech, subsequent issues of the *London Gazette* were largely filled with addresses of condolence and congratulations to the monarch from representatives of boroughs, counties, and corporations throughout the realm. The main purpose of these addresses was to exhibit loyalty to the monarchy and the new king or queen, often in

---

<sup>39</sup> Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 153; Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, 206.

<sup>40</sup> *LG*, March 26-30, 1702. Italics in original. Also, address from the Borough of St. Albans, *Ibid.*, March 19-23, 1701/2; and the address from the Borough of Leicester, *Ibid.*, March 23-26, 1701/2.

<sup>41</sup> *LG*, June 24-27, 1727. See also nt. 62 below.

<sup>42</sup> Hatton, pp. 129-31.

hopes of royal or political favor. Accession addresses performed double duty, expressing both appropriate grief over the death of the previous monarch and lauding the accession of the new one. While these loyal addresses were presented in person at court, a growing number of them were also printed for consumption by a wider audience. The extent to which the public actually read these addresses cannot be certain. However, Sarah Cowper noted in her diary that it took some time out of her day to read the addresses printed in the paper to the new George I.<sup>43</sup>

Relatively few addresses made to William and Mary in 1688/9 were announced in the *Gazette*. These were presented by parliament, clergy and civic leaders of London and very rarely printed verbatim. If representatives from boroughs and counties outside of London did travel to address the king, the *Gazette* did not mention them. This was part of a general lull in the popularity of addressing and petitioning Mark Knights observed in his study of late Stuart political culture.<sup>44</sup> Instead, the paper focused on reporting the celebrations that took place in cities and towns beyond London. In 1689, the *Gazette* dedicated more attention to describing the proclamations of William and Mary's accession, as well as local celebrations to mark their coronation, than to the addresses of individuals.

Printed addresses described the exchange that took place between the monarchs and their subjects. In 1688/9, the few addresses presented in the *Gazette* were often summarized and always short and to the point. Addressors thanked William and Mary for specific acts, most commonly, rescuing England from popery. The bishop of London along with some 100 clergy waited on the new king and queen "with an Humble Tender of their Fidelity and Duty to their

---

<sup>43</sup> Sarah Cowper, *The Diary of Sarah, Lady Cowper*, ed. Anne Kluger (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), 238-39.

<sup>44</sup> Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005), 125.

Majesties," at the Banquet House in February 1688/9.<sup>45</sup> A group of "Knights, Citizens and Burgesses in Parliament," thanked William for his offer to change the hearth tax. They told William he "fill'd [their] Hearts with an intire Satisfaction and Gratitude," and promised to make "affectionate returns."<sup>46</sup> Military officers stationed at Portsmouth told the king they were moved "by Gratitude and Love to your Person," for successfully rescuing them from popery. They promised loyalty and obedience to the king's commands.<sup>47</sup>

Upon Anne's accession in March 1701/2, the *Gazette* was flooded with a total of 400 addresses to the queen.<sup>48</sup> They were printed verbatim and varied in length from a quarter column to a full column in the newspaper. Her legitimacy allowed her subjects to freely congratulate her accession to throne. While most addresses congratulated her, some addressors expressed their congratulations in more emotive, often personal terms, describing the effect the event had on their hearts. The Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London declared their hearts to be "inflamed with Zeal and Loyalty" for the new queen, while the representatives of the city of Oxford congratulated her with "hearts full of joy."<sup>49</sup> Naval commissioners and officers declared "with unfeigned Hearts" their wish for Anne to "reign in the Hearts" of her people.<sup>50</sup> The town of Bedford declared their hearts to be "enflamed...with utmost dutiful Affection;" and the county of

---

<sup>45</sup> *LG*, February 21-25, 1688/9.

<sup>46</sup> *LG*, March 4-7, 1688/9.

<sup>47</sup> *LG*, March 14-17, 1688/9.

<sup>48</sup> Knights, 117.

<sup>49</sup> *LG*, March 9-12, 1701/2; March 19-23, 1701/2.

<sup>50</sup> *LG*, March 19-23, 1701/2.

Warwick assured Anne their address was made not "as a Matter of Course, but from the sincerity of our Hearts."<sup>51</sup>

In fact, in 1702, addressors referred to their own hearts more often than in any other reign in this study. However, they also referred to the queen's heart, echoing her speech to Parliament.<sup>52</sup> Representatives of the county of Warwick thanked Anne for her resolutions made with a "Royal English Heart."<sup>53</sup> Addressors from the town and port of New Romney declared they "could not wish for more" than a queen who declared her heart to be entirely English.<sup>54</sup> The Borough of Minehead prayed that God would bestow blessings on the queen's "Royal Head and Heart."<sup>55</sup> Anne's "Tender and Prince-like Declaration" clearly made an impression on her people.<sup>56</sup> Some addressors declared Anne's own emotions to be a reason to celebrate. The Borough of Reading praised her "Innate and Natural Affection" as a blessing that would "timely overcome and turn our Sorrow into Joy."<sup>57</sup> The Borough of Cricklade praised the queen for laying "her heart open before" them.<sup>58</sup> The queen was almost always cited as a means to alleviate her subjects' sorrow over the death of her predecessor.

---

<sup>51</sup> *LG*, April 2-6, 1702.

<sup>52</sup> Mark Knights also observes this in his study of late Stuart addresses and petitions in *Idem, Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005), 125.

<sup>53</sup> *LG*, April 2-6, 1702.

<sup>54</sup> *LG*, March 26-30, 1702.

<sup>55</sup> *LG*, April 2-6, 1702.

<sup>56</sup> Address from the County of Wilts, *LG*, March 26-30, 1702.

<sup>57</sup> *LG*, March 30-April 2, 1701/2.

<sup>58</sup> *LG*, April 6-9, 1701/2.

While heart language did not completely disappear from addresses in 1714, it was far outnumbered by promises of "affection." In 1727, declarations of "love" took the place of heart references, mimicking the language used by the king. George I was not prone to emotive language in his speeches, but his subjects referred to their own emotions as well as their fellow patriotic Englishmen in their declarations of loyalty and support.

Though George's 1714 letter lacked the personal element that Anne's contained (and which George's son would also emphasize in his first address), the king's subjects mirrored the language of the king's letter. On September 22, George addressed his council for the first time and the speech was presented in the *Gazette* three days later. He began this speech by reminding them of his answers to the addresses of the Houses of Parliament, after which there remained "very little for [him] to say upon this Occasion." Yet, he desired to give "all possible Assurances to a People, who have already Deserved so well of Me," so he briefly detailed his commitment to toleration and protecting the established church, as well as the liberties of his subjects.<sup>59</sup>

As George's subjects could not actually address an absent king, the *Gazette* did not begin printing addresses to the new George I until mid-September, after the king's arrival. The University of Oxford was among the first attendants to present their address, which told the king that, knowing the "Sincerity of [their] own Hearts," they doubted that anyone could "not support with utmost Zeal" the Protestant succession.<sup>60</sup> After George's arrival in London, the Royal Burrows of Scotland expressed their impatience for the opportunity to show the king "that we might jointly and with one Heart congratulate" the king's accession.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> *LG*, September 21 - 25, 1714.

<sup>60</sup> *LG*, September 21-25, 1714.

<sup>61</sup> *LG*, November 20-23, 1714.

George II's "Love and Affection" for his country was also repeated in numerous loyal addresses. The officials from the City of Exeter thanked Providence for providing them with a king "whose Love and Affection to Britain we have such Knowledge and Experience," in place of the deceased.<sup>62</sup> Subjects expressed their loyalty using terms that mirrored those used by the monarch. These addresses consumed much the *Gazette* and other papers until the monarch was officially crowned at the coronation.

### III. Coronation Day and commemorations

Coronations have always been widely-celebrated public occasions, and have inspired numerous guides to the meaning and form of the ceremony, most often designed for a lay audience. Most scholarship on these rites has focused on the medieval period when the form of the coronation changed to fit political, cultural and religious change. As one such study put it, "anyone who can understand the symbols, gestures, and ancient forms," of the coronation, can also "glean from the coronation rite traces of Teutonic, Christian, and Norman-French heritages that have gone to mould England into what she is."<sup>63</sup> In fact, Roy Strong calls the period starting with the "glorious" revolution of 1688/9 through the Hanoverians, "a period more important than any other for the transmission of this medieval ceremony to the modern world." For, he argues, "had it not been for the events of 1688/9, the chances are that the rite might eventually have been abandoned."<sup>64</sup> Strong asserts that the dynastic challenges faced by the monarchy during this period increased its reliance on the coronation ceremony as both a legal and commemorative

---

<sup>62</sup> *LG*, June 24-27, 1727. See also, addresses from the Borough of Reading, *Ibid.*, July 1-4, 1727; and from the Diocese of Norwich, *Ibid.*, July 4-8, 1727.

<sup>63</sup> Percy Ernst Schram, *A History of the English Coronation*, trans. Leopold G. Wickham Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), 111.

<sup>64</sup> Strong, 353.

support for the crown. The 1688/9 Bill of Rights even required the sovereign(s) to take the coronation oath both at the earliest opportunity before the Houses of Lords and Commons, as well as at the coronation.<sup>65</sup> Despite his insistence on the importance of the post-1688 period, however, even Strong relegates his examination of the ceremonies of the late Stuarts and early Hanoverians to a few mentions buried within a chapter entitled, "Insubstantial Pageants."<sup>66</sup> This is likely because these ceremonies did not begin with a grand civic entry as did those of the early Tudors and Stuarts, or the modern pageants, formed in 1831, which eschewed the activities in Westminster Hall for a carriage procession through the streets of London.<sup>67</sup>

Coronation entries were not part of the religious service and thus were optional. Entries were not requisite, but, like many other elements of royal ceremonial, employed when circumstance called for them. The last monarch to have a coronation entry was Charles II in 1661, when his court sought to celebrate the king's return with great fanfare.<sup>68</sup> James II eschewed a civic entry for reasons unknown. Kevin Sharpe suggests this may have been merely a matter of time. James wanted to be crowned as quickly as possible to avoid possible challenges.<sup>69</sup> William and Mary did not have a coronation entry, but William did proceed through London with civic dignitaries and a cortège of horse guards on December 18, 1688, nearly two months before he was pronounced king. William made his way through Hyde Park to St. James', much to the dismay of those gathered in the muddy streets in the hopes of catching a glimpse of the Prince.

---

<sup>65</sup> The Bill of Rights, 1688/9, *Statutes of the Realm*, 1 Will. and Mar., Sess 2.

<sup>66</sup> Strong, 352-419. Most of this chapter is dedicated to the late eighteenth through late nineteenth centuries.

<sup>67</sup> Strong, 400.

<sup>68</sup> Robert O. Bucholz and Joseph P. Ward, *London: A Social and Cultural History, 1550-1750* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 109.

<sup>69</sup> Sharpe (2013), 288-89.

This was commemorated in a broadside, which included an account of the procession, and included a mention of the "disappointed" crowds gathered in the streets who "were forced to run through the Dirt up to the mid-leg."<sup>70</sup> Though an official entry, this event could by no means be intended as a precursor to a coronation, as many still believed that James II would be called back to the throne. Kevin Sharpe argues that, though "not quite the ceremonial entry of a crowned king," the event was likely intended to be "a ritual form of legitimation of his expedition, a display of his popularity, and an advertisement of his virtues and qualifications for kingship."<sup>71</sup>

Anne did not make an entry on her coronation day, possibly because her recurring health problems prevented her.<sup>72</sup> But there was also no immediate need for her to do so. She was a popular queen ascending the throne through hereditary succession.

Anne's successor found the civic entry imminently suitable to his situation, though he could not postpone it until the coronation. He was a new king from a foreign land who traveled to London to claim his crown, albeit some six weeks after it had been proclaimed. George and his court knew there would be opposition to his reign among his new subjects, so a grandiose entry was likely an obvious decision, even for a king who "tried to avoid unnecessary fuss and ostentation."<sup>73</sup> The Earl Marshall saw to it that the occasion would be properly celebrated, organizing it based on the precedent of William III's triumphal entry to celebrate the Treaty of Ryswick in 1697.<sup>74</sup> The event was grand, by all available accounts, but only commemorated by a

---

<sup>70</sup> *A True Account of his Highness the Prince of Orange's Coming to St. James's...* (London, 1688).

<sup>71</sup> Sharpe (2013), 451.

<sup>72</sup> Bucholz notes that Anne experienced a bout of gout around the time of her coronation in, Idem, (1993), 220.

<sup>73</sup> Ragnhild Hatton, *George I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978), 132.

<sup>74</sup> CA, Miscellaneous Collections Vol. 1, 68.



handful of publications. One account, which included details of the procession, was buried in the last pages of a book on the king's life.<sup>75</sup> The dissenter Ferdinando Shaw published a sermon commemorating George's accession and arrival that praised the "loud Acclamations" that welcomed the king on his progress through the city. Shaw declared he did not "believe any one Person in that long Procession more heartily rejoiced at the Solemnity of that Day; A Day, far more Glorious for the happy Prospect it affords us in its Consequences, than in its Glittering Appearance."<sup>76</sup> George's biographer asserts that most of the king's subjects "reserved their judgment" of their new sovereign, however, Hatton attributes the cheers that greeted George upon his arrival in the capital to "the very impact of majesty, the awe with which the mythology surrounding the sovereign imposed, even in the Early Enlightenment."<sup>77</sup> Hatton also notes that dissenters such as Shaw were especially happy at the king's accession, because they hoped he would put an end to the restrictions they had endured under Anne.<sup>78</sup>

The disappearance of the coronation entry through the streets of London was a matter of practicality. Prior to George I, the last king to make a civic entry upon becoming king was the restored Charles II, who reclaimed his crown after years of Puritan rule. William and Mary could have justified such an event, but it would have been at the expense of public opinion which, if Evelyn's account is any indication, thought the royal couple's contrition lacking.<sup>79</sup> In the case of

---

<sup>75</sup> Anon., *An historical account of our present sovereign George-Lewis, King of Great Britain...* (London, 1714), 186-190.

<sup>76</sup> Ferdinando Shaw, *A Sermon on the death of Queen Anne: The Happy Accession of King George to the Throne: and His Safe Arrive in the British Dominions* (London, 1714), ii.

<sup>77</sup> Ragnhild Hatton, *George I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978), 173.

<sup>78</sup> Hatton, 173.

<sup>79</sup> Evelyn (2012), 529.

George I, it was important for him to make his presence known to his subjects, since he had technically been king for six weeks prior to arriving in the country. Anne and George II had no need to make an entry - whether attached to the coronation or not. William's entry in 1688 nor George I's entry in 1714 each introduced the newly-arrived sovereign to their subjects.

The absence of coronation entries significantly diminished the public's opportunities to witness their monarch(s) on the coronation day. Each of the coronations from 1688/9 to 1714 began with a procession of the new monarch and a train of nobility and government officials. Admittance was not allowed into Westminster Abbey except for those who held tickets, but the processions to and from the Abbey provided spectators with opportunities to catch a glimpse of their sovereign, however brief. On April 11, 1688/9, after travelling "privately" to Westminster Hall from Whitehall Palace around ten o'clock in the morning, William and Mary were there dressed in coronation robes. They were then presented with the swords and spurs, and then the coronation regalia, which had been brought from Westminster Abbey to Westminster Hall by a procession of deans and prebends dressed in scarlet.<sup>80</sup> Being properly robed and decked with the trappings of monarchy, William and Mary processed across the palace yard from Westminster Hall to Westminster Abbey. A broadside printed to illustrate the occasion to the masses reported that the entire procession walked upon blue cloth laid from the throne in Westminster Hall to the steps of the Abbey.<sup>81</sup> The procession remained the same through the next three coronations. Anne proceeded in much the same way to the Abbey from the Hall. The one difference is that

---

<sup>80</sup> According to Michele Brown, this "attractive piece of minor ceremonial was abandoned after George IV's Coronation when the use of Westminster Hall was abandoned," in, Eadem, *Ritual of Royalty: The Ceremony and Pageantry of Britain's Monarchy* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson Ltd., 1983), 19.

<sup>81</sup> *A Description of the Ceremonial Proceedings at the Coronation of their Most Sacred Majesties King William III and Queen Mary II*, (London, 1689).

she was carried "in a Low Open Chair all the way," on account of ill health.<sup>82</sup> George I also processed from the Hall to the Abbey on blue cloth.<sup>83</sup>

Bucholz and Ward have called public events such as the coronation procession, "love fests" in which "both partners got to display themselves to best advantage, both laid themselves out hierarchically, thus reinforcing the prevailing worldview, and both responded to the cues of the other."<sup>84</sup> The procession, though short in duration, provided some opportunity for spectators to see their new sovereign. Importantly, the procession returned the newly-crowned monarch to the Hall in the same order, with the king or queen wearing the crown. The audience thus had a chance to see the monarch before and after being crowned. This made the spectators outside the Abbey witnesses to the event - an effect made greater by participating in the "loud acclamations" that not only attended the procession to and from the Abbey, but also at the as part of the ceremony. Before the monarch received the crown, scepter and orb, the audience in the Abbey voiced their assent by "a great Shout from each side of the Theatre."<sup>85</sup> It was necessary for the people to assent to the relationship solidified by the coronation. Directly after the crown was placed on the royal head, the people "express(ed) their joy with loud acclamations," drums and trumpets were played, and guns discharged to signal to the crowds outside the Abbey that their new sovereign had been officially crowned.<sup>86</sup> The vocal affirmations from those within the

---

<sup>82</sup> *LG*, April 23-27, 1702; Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, 220.

<sup>83</sup> *CA*, L19, p. 181.

<sup>84</sup> Bucholz and Ward, 108.

<sup>85</sup> *CA*, L19, 144.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*

Abbey would have been heard outside it as well, making the spectators outside aural witnesses to the moment.

Each event attracted a large number of people. So much so, that the planning committee had to engineer crowd control methods outside the Abbey as well as inside it. In 1714, a portion of the scaffolding erected for spectators collapsed killing and injuring many.<sup>87</sup> In 1727, scaffolding was erected outside the Abbey to allow for spectators to view the procession.<sup>88</sup> The expected attendance was so great that the committee appointed to plan the coronation decided that the original scaffold was "so slight that the lives of many of his Majesty(ice's) subject may be endangered." To avoid potential loss of lives, as well as "encroachments" on public streets and highways, the committee decided to erect additional scaffolding on September 8.<sup>89</sup> The planning committee also ordered the procession route to be lined with rails to maintain crowds, and to raise the ground 18 inches "for better view of the procession."<sup>90</sup> Therefore, those who did not manage to obtain a ticket (which were given out sparingly and to members of the nobility and government), were afforded an opportunity to be participatory witnesses to the event.

The unfortunate event of faulty scaffolding in 1714 provides a glimpse of who attended these events and in what sections they were seated. A baronet's son, heir to £6,000 per annum, paid two guineas for a seat in the palace yard. He was killed in the collapse, as was a pregnant gentleman's wife, Mrs. Jane Ogleby. Among the wounded in palace yard were an victualler, an

---

<sup>87</sup> *List of all the Persons who were Kill'd, Wounded or Bruis'd by the falling of Three Scaffold, in the Palace-Yard, Little-Sentry, and Westminster Abbey, On Wednesday the 20th Instant of October 1714, being the day of His Majesty's Royal Coronation* (London, 1714). This list provides personal details, even specifics of their injuries, for some victims, and only names others.

<sup>88</sup> I have found no evidence of such implements outside the Abbey in 1688/9 or 1702.

<sup>89</sup> CA, Miscellaneous Collections Vol. 1, 80.

<sup>90</sup> TNA, SP 36/3/92-93.

apothecary, a weaver, a midwife, and "a lusty fat woman" named Mary Price. The scaffold in little sentry took fewer victims, killing a Lady Butler, two brewer's servants, a shoemaker and a woman only identified as Mrs. Hayes. Finally, the scaffold in Westminster Abbey killed four ladies, two identified as nobility, and injured Mrs. Jenkins, Mrs. Matthews and Mr. Dennison (no professions were provided).<sup>91</sup> Access to these scaffolds required tickets, and doubtless, seats in the less desirable (nose-bleed) sections cost less than better-situated seats.<sup>92</sup> It thus seems likely that these sections were segregated by class. However, this event provides evidence of the wide variety of people who attended coronations. These events drew people from the servant classes as well as the nobility.

The scaffolding erected outside the Abbey held a wider variety of people than the scaffolding within the Abbey. It was important that the Abbey be filled with nobility and government officials to show support for the new reign. To this end, the court distributed tickets for spectators and personalized invitations for processors, frequently (but not always) signed by the new monarch. In 1727, George II's court distributed 1,700 tickets for his coronation.<sup>93</sup> The right to determine who was to receive these coveted tickets was sometimes contested, as in 1714, when the Earl Marshall found it necessary to stake his claim by detailing the precedents granting

---

<sup>91</sup> *List of all the Persons who were Kill'd, Wounded or Bruis'd by the falling of Three Scaffold, in the Palace-Yard, Little-Sentry, and Westminster Abbey, On Wednesday the 20th Instant of October 1714, being the day of His Majesty's Royal Coronation* (London, 1714).

<sup>92</sup> Tickets were given to those admitted into the Abbey itself, but tickets for the scaffolding were often, if not always, sold. At the funeral of George II, 600 tickets were available for seats in the scaffold. The first five rows of scaffolding were two guineas each, the next five rows were one and a half guineas, and the rest of the seats were a half guinea each: CA SML, 271-273.

<sup>93</sup> CA, Miscellaneous Collections Vol. 1, 108-115.

said right to the Earl Marshall back to the coronation of Charles I.<sup>94</sup> But not everyone who was granted a ticket was able (or willing) to attend. This was especially a problem in 1714, when some would-be participants recued themselves, using such excuses as ill health or other engagements, but found themselves instead in anti-coronation demonstrations in towns outside London.<sup>95</sup> Smith notes that even in coronation celebrations in cities and towns outside London, local nobility and civic officials vied for their place in the procession.<sup>96</sup>

The coronation service that took place inside the Abbey, while obscured from public view, was intentionally based on precedent which was made available to the public in the form of histories published on the occasion of each coronation.<sup>97</sup> The coronation ceremony represented the continuity of the government and royal power. Each coronation, therefore, intentionally mimicked previous coronations, with some minor alterations as the situation required. Anne's coronation was modeled after William and Mary's.<sup>98</sup> According to Strong, William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, compiled what would become the precedent for future coronations from those of James II, William and Mary and Queen Anne. He was especially reliant on Tenison's revisions for Anne's coronation, whom he said "took great pains

---

<sup>94</sup> CA, Coronations – Queen Anne / George I, f. 32. The heralds fought over many details of royal ceremonies, especially if they thought they were not being given due respect.

<sup>95</sup> Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 173.

<sup>96</sup> Smith, 156.

<sup>97</sup> Anon., *The form of prayers and services used in Westminster-Abby at the coronation of the kings and queens of England with account of the procession from the Palace to the Abby* (London, 1689); Robert Douglas, *The form and o[rder] of the coronation of Charles the Second, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland* (Edinburgh, reprinted 1700); Anon., *An account of the Ceremonies observed at the Coronation of the Kings and Queens of England* (London, 1727).

<sup>98</sup> TNA, LC 2/15/1.

to settle this office in a better method than had ever been done before."<sup>99</sup> In 1727, George II's coronation was altered to allow for a queen consort.<sup>100</sup> Guides published for the public emphasized the ceremony's reliance on historical precedent, which bolstered the appearance of the smooth transition of power and continuity of royal authority. The few changes that did take place, therefore, were the result of necessity. Indeed, John Evelyn even commented on William III's coronation that, "What was different from former Coronations was some alteration in the Coronation oath."<sup>101</sup> This alteration was especially important and thus made available to the public in broadsides and newspapers, because of its importance to the crown's relationship to the people.

#### IV. The Coronation Oath and Changing Relationships of Power

Though the format of the ceremony remained more or less the same throughout the period, the most important change was to the coronation oath. The oath, taken by the new king or queen signified their commitment to their subjects. It was also a legal act in which the responsibilities of the monarch were laid out. According to Wilkinson, "there is no single document in British history in which more of importance is stated in fewer words," because the oath was the foundation of the king's legal right to rule.<sup>102</sup> It also expressed the reason for the hierarchy of authority, which the king (or queen) was to uphold. As a legal document, it had to be altered to suit political expediency. The oath taken by William and Mary in 1688/9 shows a significant change in the nature of the crown's power, as well as its relationship to the nation.

---

<sup>99</sup> Wake quoted in Strong, 377.

<sup>100</sup> TNA, SP 36/3/92-93.

<sup>101</sup> John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn, Esq., F.R.S. from 1641 to 1705-6 with Memoir*, ed. William Bray (London: Gibbings and Company, 1895; Forgotten Books, 2012), 532.

<sup>102</sup> B. Wilkinson, *The Coronation in History* (London: The Historical Association, 1953), 12.

On April 23, 1685/6, James II and his wife Mary of Modena were crowned at Westminster. James alone took the oath "usually taken by [his] Predecessors," which vested him with the authority of his forbearers and the power of tradition.<sup>103</sup> He promised the "People of England" he would uphold "the Laws and Customs to them granted by the Kings of England, [his] lawful and religious Predecessors," which agreed to "the Prerogative of Kings thereof and the ancient Customs of this Realm."<sup>104</sup> In 1685, royal bloodline and ancient custom were the source of the king's power.

In 1688/9, following James' overthrow, both William and Mary took the oath, Mary echoing William's promises. As queen regnant, Mary was crowned alongside her husband, rather than as a consort, as James' wife had been in 1685/6. Whereas the previous coronation had presented the king with the oath taken by his "Predecessors," William and Mary were simply presented with "the oath." Both monarchs pledged to "govern The People of this Kingdom of England, and the Dominions thereto belonging, according to the Statutes in Parliament agreed on, and the Laws & Customs of the Same."<sup>105</sup> This new oath solidified a shift in royal authority. The monarch was no longer the primary authority in English government, but ruled with Parliament. The oath was printed in a broadside for the public to inspect, demonstrating that the king now relied on the will of the people (or at least those among the elite).<sup>106</sup>

This altered coronation oath was the result of some debate among politicians. Roy Strong characterizes this debate as part of the ongoing tensions between tradition and Lockean notions

---

<sup>103</sup> CA, L 19, 23.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., 24.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 95-96.

<sup>106</sup> *The Form of the Intended Coronation Oath...* (Edinburgh, 1689).



of sovereignty. A committee consisting of nine Tories and thirty Whigs was formed in February 1688/9 to reinterpret the traditional coronation oath to solidify the rule of a more or less elected king. According to Strong, this committee was "most concerned that there should never be a repetition of recent events."<sup>107</sup> The Whig version of the oath won out in a split of 188 votes to 149 and re-drew the foundations of royal authority in terms that justified and solidified the overthrow of the Catholic King James.<sup>108</sup> Some scholars argue that this oath was designed to limit royal power. Strong argues that the crown continued to wield considerable power, despite the pledge to uphold parliamentary law.<sup>109</sup> Regardless of the monarch's political clout, this new oath brought the source of royal power from heaven to earth.

Anne took the same oath at her coronation on April 23, 1701/2.<sup>110</sup> It was, however, not immediately following the sermon, as at William and Mary's coronation; instead it followed a declaration added to ensure the Protestant succession. Anne was the first monarch to declare at her coronation that she "believe[d] that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ."<sup>111</sup> Adding this declaration to the service barred Catholics from the throne, especially those who might claim a right to the crown through the lineage of Anne's exiled half-brother.

---

<sup>107</sup> Strong, 284.

<sup>108</sup> Strong, 286.

<sup>109</sup> Strong, 287.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid, 129. The herald responsible for this account did not find it necessary to recount the "very long" ceremony in detail, and instead referred the reader to the account of William and Mary's coronation in 1688/9, on which Anne's coronation was based.

<sup>111</sup> Quoted in Strong, 287.

The oath remained the same and successive kings pledged to uphold the laws of Parliament and protect the Protestant religion. In George I's reign, however, another addition was made. In 1727, prior to the coronation of George II, Wake noted in his copy of the coronation service that a clause was to be added to the traditional oath. This new clause, settled by the lawyer Sir Edward Northey for George I's coronation, pledged to "maintain & preserve the Settlement of the Ch(urch) of E(ngland) and the [??], Worship, Discipline, and Government thereof as by Law established."<sup>112</sup> This highlighted the duty owed to the Church by the German Lutheran kings. Again, the oath was altered - however slightly - to suit the occasion.

The oath was especially important because it demonstrated the king or queen's dedication to uphold the will of Parliament and protecting the Protestant religion. This oath was printed in 1688/9 and in a 23-page account of the entire coronation ceremony in 1714.<sup>113</sup> In 1727, the oath only appears to have been included within a 56-page account of George II and Caroline's coronation published in Dublin.<sup>114</sup> The coronation oath was an especially potent reminder of the relationship between the crown and its subjects. Kings and queens were now required to uphold the laws of the land, instituted by Parliament. This became key to the monarch's worth after traditional notions of divine right had to be renegotiated. As will be discussed below, throughout the period, clergymen focused increasingly on the importance of the new relationship between sovereign and subject, based in reason, rather than fear.

---

<sup>112</sup> Lambeth Palace, MS 1079a, 17.

<sup>113</sup> *The form of the intended coronation oath agreed upon by the committee* (London and Edinburgh, 1689); *An exact account of the form and ceremony of His Majesty's coronation* (London, 1714), 8-9.

<sup>114</sup> *The ceremonial of the coronation of His most sacred Majesty King George II* (Dublin, 1727). I have found no evidence that this was published elsewhere.

The oath was published in a variety of forms and contexts. In each reign, accounts of the coronation proceedings were published for public consumption. These varied in length and level of detail and were published in the *Gazette*, other newspapers and in pamphlets.<sup>115</sup> Details of the coronation were printed to provide access to the event as well as provide authority to the reign.

Coronation accounts were sometimes included in texts published to bolster support through other means. For instance, one problem George I faced upon arrival in England was expressed by the preacher John Abernethy, who noted that the king's "Distance from us hitherto has made it difficult for us particularly to know his Virtues."<sup>116</sup> To remedy such "Distance," an anonymous account of the George's character was published to commemorate his birthday on May 28, in 1715. This brief and "impartial" character also included a detailed description of the coronation ceremony and a copy of the oath. This not only gave the British public a court-sanctioned image of George to make him more knowable, it was also intended to remedy the "Scandalous Invectives and Rebellious Libels... [used] in order to Corrupt and Alienate the Minds of His Majesties Loyal Subjects from their Allegiance."<sup>117</sup> This "grand exemplar" painted George as a thoughtful, frugal king, who had no addiction, save hunting, and who did, in fact, know English, and would "speak it in time."<sup>118</sup> Though the king was reserved in public, the

---

<sup>115</sup> See for instance: *LG*, April 11-15, 1689; April 22-27, 1702; October 19-23, 1714; and October 10-14, 1727. Anon., *An Account of the Ceremonial at the Coronation of their Majesties King William and Queen Mary* (London, 1689); Earl Marshall, *The Form of Proceeding to the Coronation of Her Most Excellent Majesty Queen Anne* (London, 1702); Earl Marshall, *The form of the proceeding to the royal coronation of their Majesties King George II and Queen Caroline from Westminster-Hall to the Abbey* (London, 1727).

<sup>116</sup> John Abernethy, *The People's Choice, the Lord's Anointed. A Thanksgiving Sermon for his Most Excellent Majesty King George, His Happy Accession to the Throne, his Arrival, and Coronation* (Belfast, 1714), 20.

<sup>117</sup> *The grand exemplar, Set forth, in an Impartial character Of His Sacred Majesty King George. With some remarkables of his life. Being, a seasonabe [sic] memorial for the 28th of May, the day of his most auspicious birth. To which is added, His Majesties inauguration; together With the Declaration and Coronation Oath* (London, 1715), unpaginated.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

author hoped that "none of our Countrymen will be so injudicious as to think his Reservedness the effect of Sullenness or Pride."<sup>119</sup> Though published anonymously, this book cannot but have been a production of the court. It presented intimate knowledge of the new king to his people, alongside a detailed description of the coronation ceremony that solidified his position as ruler of the realm.

While the coronation ceremony itself, especially the coronation oath, was a potent means to demonstrate the power and legitimacy of the monarchy, it was somewhat limited in its instructive capability. For more detailed counsel on how to properly act and feel loyal, both the court and the public turned to the pulpit.

#### V. Coronation Sermons: *Whilst the hearts of the people were...rightly tun'd and ready for praise*

Eighteenth-century coronation sermons have been shrugged off by some historians as unimportant boilerplate that pandered to the new monarch. D. J. Sturdy's study of seventeenth century sermons, which he clearly found more exciting than their successors, concluded that "eighteenth and nineteenth-century coronation sermons are banal by comparison with those of the seventeenth; they express little more than polite expressions of goodwill towards the monarch about to be crowned."<sup>120</sup> According to Roy Strong, John Sharpe's sermon given at Anne's coronation in 1702, "struck the death knell of the great age of the Coronation sermon," by virtue of its brevity.<sup>121</sup> While Sharpe's sermon was considerably shorter than his predecessors',

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>120</sup> David J. Sturdy, "English Coronation Sermons in the Seventeenth Century," in *Herrscherweihe und Königskrönung im Frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, ed. Heinz Durchhardt (Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag, 1983), 81.

<sup>121</sup> Strong, 341.

Strong's theory neglects the proliferation of coronation sermons in 1702, 1714 and 1727. The number of coronation sermons increased between 1688 and 1702. Though many publications appeared celebrating the coronation, a search of the English Short Title catalogue suggests that only Burnet's sermon preached at the coronation itself was published in 1688 or 1689. In 1702, John Sharpe's official coronation sermon was one of five coronation sermons. Nine sermons were published in 1714 or 1715 to commemorate George I's coronation, and seven appeared in 1727 or 1728 for George II's coronation. In each case, the official sermon preached in the ceremony itself was published in multiple editions, but not every sermon experienced such distribution. This meant that the public had access not only to the official message given in Westminster Abbey, but also to those given in parishes around the country. This is likely, in part, the result of the expiration of the licensing act in 1695; but it also suggests that there was a demand for such publications - not only from patrons but also from consumers. In short, it suggests that the public wanted to read these sermons.

Coronation sermons, whether preached as part of the coronation ceremony itself or given to commemorate the occasion, all shared two basic goals: to describe the duties of the king or queen and the duties of their subjects, as well as impress upon them the obligation of loyalty to a monarch whose most basic task was to provide for the happiness of the English people. At the core of the duties assigned to the new monarchs was their responsibility for the peace and happiness of their people. Clergymen approached this all-encompassing duty differently, depending on cultural or political circumstances. Following the revolution of 1688, Burnet detailed the characteristics necessary to bring about a New Jerusalem in England; that is, to make it a pious and prosperous nation. He warned of the dangers of an unjust king who did not rule in proper (Protestant) fear of God. By the coronation of George II, the tone of sermons had changed

from dire warnings of a fragile state, to celebrations of the security and prosperity of a Protestant dynasty. As the focus of sermons shifted, so did the prescribed emotional comportment of both monarch and subject. By 1727, the tone of the coronation sermon had shifted completely, from focusing on fear to celebrating the political stability created by a secure royal dynasty. Rather than urging subjects to fear the repercussions of disobedience, sermons commemorating George II's accession told subjects to maintain social and political stability by loving a deserving prince.

Sermons provided guidance on how to feel about the new monarch. While coronation sermons invariably promoted positive feelings toward the monarch, the focus of those feelings, or the justifications for them, changed to suit the political situation. William was hailed as the saviour of the people, as the king who would put England on the path to becoming the "New Jerusalem." Gilbert Burnet's sermon given at William and Mary's coronation in 1689 focused on the attributes of a just king. He based his sermon on 2 Samuel 23:3, 4 (*The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah*), and used the majority of the sermon to elaborate the pitfalls of not ruling in fear of God. He emphasized the subject's duty to support the king and fear God to bring stability and piety to the nation. With his sermon, Burnet sought to bolster the rule of William and Mary by focusing on the right of the English people to be governed by a just king. He defined government as the right of "free and reasonable Beings, who need indeed to be governed, but ought not be broken by the force and weight of Power."<sup>122</sup> He warned both the new monarchs and their subjects that to govern out of a "sullen Authority" would be "to exact of [men] that which is either impossible or unreasonable, and to carry this Rule too far into that

---

<sup>122</sup> Burnet, 5

which is God's immediate Province, I mean, *Mens Consciencies*."<sup>123</sup> It was important for a king to be just, otherwise his subjects might decide to throw off the "yoke" of unjust prince who ruled with no regard to religion.<sup>124</sup>

According to Burnet, it was the king's responsibility to guide his subjects to piety by punishing wickedness. A just prince was to loathe drunkenness, lies and curses. This would lead the people towards piety, because "how many of our Passions would then fall off, when we should have no more occasion for them."<sup>125</sup> It was thus necessary for the king to govern the unruly passions of his people.

The key to bringing in the New Jerusalem, Burnet counseled, was a pious king to rule by example. He held up the Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius as a "sublime pattern" of a good ruler. According to Burnet, Aurelius turned the empire around after the rule of bad emperors by eschewing pomp, spectacle and flattery - all marks of a weak and unjust ruler. Aurelius ruled through reason, and was "never once seen either transported with Anger or with Joy."<sup>126</sup>

In 1688/9, the state was fragile, having just seen the overthrow of the second crowned head within fifty years - a fact very much in the minds of many in Burnet's audience. Burnet emphasized the need to govern not only the passions of the people, but rule with a steady hand, never being "transported with Anger or with Joy." While his sermon focused on the attributes of a good king, through his emphasis on the monarch's duty to lead by example, Burnet counseled both sovereign and subject to govern their passions, whether this be drunkenness or joy.

---

<sup>123</sup> Burnet, 9.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 17.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 26.

William and Mary faced the problem of an initially tenuous rule, undermined by their uncertain claim to the throne. When Anne succeeded William on the throne in 1702, she faced a very different political situation. She was the rightful heir to the throne by birth (and by act of Parliament); her weakness lay in the fact that she was a woman. Bucholz argues that Anne's gender was actually an asset, which made her more popular among her subjects because it tied her to the ever-popular Elizabeth I and that Anne, "may have represented a more maternal, and therefore softer and more comfortable, embodiment of political and religious authority than her male predecessors."<sup>127</sup> However, Bucholz also recognizes that Anne's gender was "a handicap" amongst the ruling elites.<sup>128</sup> The sermon given by John Sharpe, Archbishop of York, at Anne's coronation on April 23, 1702, simultaneously celebrated her femininity and defended her right to rule. Sharpe used the verse, *Kings will be thy Nursing-Fathers and their Queens thy Nursing-Mothers* (Isaiah 49:23), to argue (to good effect) that queens were equal to kings, as well as explain the ideal relationship between pious English subjects and their queen.

Sharpe reminded his audience that they relied on Anne for their welfare, both spiritually and materially. He evoked the reign of Elizabeth I in his defense of Anne's claim to the throne. He credited Elizabeth with "perfecting" her father's work of making England a Protestant nation. He said, "Her reign alone will let us see, that it was not without great reason, that in my Text *Queens* are joyn'd as equal Sharers with *Kings*, in making up the *Blessing* which is here promis'd to GOD's People."<sup>129</sup> According to Isaiah 49:23, Sharpe argued, queens were just as capable as kings of just and pious rule/leading their people to the New Jerusalem.

---

<sup>127</sup> Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, 348.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid.

<sup>129</sup> John Sharpe, *Sermon Preach'd at the Coronation of Queen Anne* (London, 1702), 8.



The majority of Sharpe's sermon focused on the relationship that ought to exist between the queen and her subjects. For him, the key to this relationship was familial bonds. It was Anne's duty to not only act, but to feel like a proper nursing mother towards her subjects. Sharpe said that, if only all princes would take this verse to heart, "with what Zeal would it inspire them for their People's Good?"<sup>130</sup> Just as Sharpe urged Anne to look upon her people as her children, he likewise urged her subjects to "always bear in Mind what returns of *Duty* and *Gratitude*, and *Filial Obedience*, this Consideration of the Queen's being a *Nursing-Mother* to *Her People* doth call for from us, and all other Her subjects."<sup>131</sup>

Sharpe was by no means the first to urge monarchs to look upon their subjects as a parent would their children. In 1661, George Morley, Bishop of Worcester told Charles II that a proper and just king "governs his subjects as a *Father* doth his *Children*."<sup>132</sup> Unlike his predecessors, however, Sharpe lay special emphasis on the emotional bond between parents and their children. As he urged Anne to look upon her subjects with parental affection, he likewise entreated her subjects to consider this relationship and "think themselves obliged to bear the same *Love* and *Affection*, to pay the same *Honour* and *Reverence*, and *Obedience* to their *Nursing Mothers* as they do their *Natural Parents*."<sup>133</sup>

Luke Beaulieu also used Isaiah 49:23 to emphasize the familial bond between sovereign and subject. Though he focused on the queen's duty to "nurse" the church, he also argued that

---

<sup>130</sup> Sharpe, 3.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>132</sup> *A sermon preach'd at the most magnificent coronation of the most high and mighty King Charles IId* (London, 1661), 37.

<sup>133</sup> Sharpe, 12

Anne's virtues would "equally recommend Her to the Veneration and Love of all her People."<sup>134</sup>

Anne deserved her people's affection because her "Affection to this Kingdom is derived from Nature, and strengthened by the same common Interest. If social and religious Vertues, Piety towards God, Justice and Good Nature to Men, can recommend any Sovereign to the Love and Reverence of their People, the Queen hath a just Right to the utmost Love and Veneration that can be paid to any Prince."<sup>135</sup>

These same virtues that made Anne worthy of her subjects' love, were also to be followed as a "Royal Pattern." Beaulieu asserted, "if we would but study to imitate that Royal Vertue and Piety which now shines before us, and take a serious Care of our own Souls in the discharge of our several Duties; That would certainly heal all our Breaches and calm our angry Passions, and make us promote the common Happiness and Tranquility of us all."<sup>136</sup> Sharpe similarly opined that, if subjects made it "their study to live in as much Peace and Unity with their Fellow-Subjects, as if they dwelt together in one Family," they "would not for difference in Opinion, about the Methods of publick Conduct, break into *Parties* and *Factions*."<sup>137</sup> Most of the sermons published to commemorate Anne's coronation in 1702 mention the rifts caused by political disagreement which grew in the wake of the Revolution of 1688. While Gilbert Burnet had sought to discourage political factions by presenting William (and, by extension, Mary) as a just and righteous ruler, who was to be feared and obeyed lest they risk the wrath of an angry God,

---

<sup>134</sup> Luke Beaulieu, *A Sermon on the Coronation-Day, April 23, 1702, Preach'd in the Cathedral Church of Gloucester, Before the Mayor and Corporation* (London, 1702), 22.

<sup>135</sup> Beaulieu, 18-19.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>137</sup> Sharpe, 12.

preachers in 1702 opted for a different approach, arguing that the key to unity was to cultivate familial love. This was to be a recurring theme for the following reigns.

The problem of party strife did not diminish when George I took the throne in 1714. Jacobite threats became an ever-greater problem, and the new king faced sometimes violent threats from the beginning of his reign.<sup>138</sup> Unlike in 1702, clergymen did not tend towards the same verse for the basis of their sermons; instead, they opted for verses that showed the nation how and why they should rejoice in the crowning of their new king. William Talbot, then Bishop of London was faced with the task of rallying support for the new Hanoverian line. Eschewing the fear-mongering of post-Revolution rhetoric in 1688/89, Talbot used Psalm 118:24 (*This is the day the Lord hath made, let us rejoice and be Glad in it*) to expound on the good luck of the English people. He began with the story of King David's accession, explaining that the Tribes of Israel had set Ishbosheth up to be king. After Ishbosheth was conveniently killed, David became king, thus uniting the Tribes with the kingdom of Judah. According to Talbot this was recognized to be "the wonderful Providence of God," which caused David's subjects to "break out in joyful and thankful acknowledgments of God's Mercy."<sup>139</sup> The people rejoiced because "having a Prince set over them, who being endued with all the requisite Qualifications for his high Office, they had all the reason in the World to believe would be a King after theirs, as well as *God's own Heart*."<sup>140</sup> David was God's chosen not because of his lineage, but because of his

---

<sup>138</sup> Lady Sarah Cowper commented on the danger the king faced in diary on September 20, 1714: *The Diary of Sarah, Lady Cowper*, ed. Anne Kluger (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), 237.

<sup>139</sup> William Talbot, *The Bishop of Oxford's Sermon at the Coronation* (London, 1714), 8.

<sup>140</sup> Talbot, 9; italics in original.

qualifications. Not only was David's military valor apparent, but he was a "Man of Prudence and Wisdom," who would govern them "with Tenderness as a Shepherd doth his Sheep."<sup>141</sup>

After this story of the unexpected king as a gift from God, Talbot told the audience, "now I fancy you going in your Thoughts before me in the Application of my Text to the great Solemnity of this Day; your Hearts fired with a pious Emmulation to out-do the subjects of David in your joyful Exultations upon it."<sup>142</sup> But in case the parallel was lost on his audience, Talbot provided a litany of contemporary reasons to rejoice for George's accession. First and foremost, Talbot traced the lineage of George's claim to the throne to the Revolution of 1688/89. He presented George's accession as the direct consequence of William's overthrow of popish tyranny. More importantly, Anne's failure to produce an heir had placed the country once again in threat of invasion by the Pretender. If not for the succession of a qualified Protestant prince, the kingdom would have been ripe for the taking, because they were "not only unguarded, but wretchedly broken into Parties and Factions at home."<sup>143</sup> George was thus the remedy to England's factious politics.

Talbot's task was similar to Burnet's 25 years prior - to make a foreign prince a welcome sight to his English subjects. Like Burnet, Talbot focused on the threat of Catholicism and tyranny from the continent. But Talbot took a more positive route, emphasizing the reasons the English people should *rejoyce* in George's accession, rather than reasons they should fear the Pretender. Nor was Talbot alone, other sermons given to commemorate George I's accession and

---

<sup>141</sup> Talbot, 9.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., 16.

coronation focused on the "two Parties struggling in our very Bowels."<sup>144</sup> George was hailed as the king who would "be the Healer of our Breaches, and revive that Charity, which is almost lost in the Unmaterial Fire of blind Zeal & Party Fury."<sup>145</sup> He urged George's subjects to "friendly joyn Heart and Hands together, to make [the blessing of George's accession] as lasting as it is diffusive."<sup>146</sup>

Most sermons given to commemorate George's accession and coronation took his defense as their task. Opponents of the Hanoverian succession alleged that George's accession subverted the divinely-ordained hereditary succession. Supporters sought to counter this by redefining the definition of divine ordination. The Irish Presbyterian John Abernethy argued most succinctly in his aptly-titled sermon, *The People's Choice, the Lord's Anointed*, that God's choice was that of the people. Basing his approach on a Lockean idea of governance, Abernethy argued that "as the *Consent of the People* is the only *Just Foundation* of Government; the Right of the Person Governing must be deriv'd from the same Spring."<sup>147</sup> He argued that subverting the "lineal succession" was "no more than is practis'd in all States and Governments."<sup>148</sup> The dissenting clergyman Ferdinando Shaw argued that to be chosen by Parliament, as George had been, was equal to the "Right of Blood," and that the Pretender and his supporters used the "ridiculous Pretence of a Hereditary Right" in their attempts to place the Pretender on the throne.<sup>149</sup> Hannah

---

<sup>144</sup> Joseph Acres, *Great Britain's jubilee; or the Joyful Day. Preached at Blewbury, August 1, 1715. Being the Day of His Majesty's Happy Accession to the Throne* (London, 1715), 25.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>146</sup> Talbot, 29.

<sup>147</sup> Abernethy, 9.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>149</sup> Ferdinando Shaw, *A Sermon on the Death of Queen Anne: The Happy Accession of King George to the Throne: and His Safe Arrival in the British Dominions* (London, 1714), 15, 24.

Smith has shown that the court successfully presented George as the inheritor of William III's mission to defend Protestantism in England and abroad.<sup>150</sup> Sermons commemorating his accession and coronation used not only the threat of Jacobite invasion, but the notion that royal authority was bestowed by God via the will of the people as well, to create support for the new Hanoverian dynasty.

Sermons given for George I's coronation sought to unify the nation behind its new Protestant protector who ruled by the authority of Parliament. Some clergymen used the language of paternal affection to inspire support for George. Talbot urged coronation spectators to "joyn Hearts and Hands" to thank God for the blessing of the new king. Shaw's sermon said that the people were obligated to "*acknowledge all Faith and Constant Obedience to [George], with all hearty and humble Affection.*"<sup>151</sup> The Presbyterian Samuel Rosewell told his flock that George's piety placed the king in God's good graces, which was certain to "render him, and his Subjects yet more happy in higher Degrees of mutual Affection and Love."<sup>152</sup> Upon George's death, clergymen used these same themes to emphasize the obligation of loyal subjects to join together in joy for the accession of his son.

In 1727, John Potter, then Bishop of Oxford, gave the sermon at the coronation of George II and his consort, Queen Caroline. Like Talbot, Potter chose to focus on the reasons the nation should rejoice in the accession of their new king. Taking as his text 2 Chronicles 9:8 (*Blessed be the Lord thy God, which delighted in thee to set thee on his throne, to be King, for the Lord thy*

---

<sup>150</sup> Hannah Smith, *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714-1760* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

<sup>151</sup> Shaw, 16.

<sup>152</sup> Samuel Rosewell, *The King's True Divine Right. The Flourishing of his Crown: and the Shame of his Enemies: A Sermon preach'd upon Occasion of His Majesty's Coronation* (London, 1714), 21.

*God: because thy God loved Israel, to establish them for ever, therefore made he thee king over them, to do judgment and justice*), Potter urged his audience to see the king's accession as a gift from God. He drew from this verse that George was, indeed, chosen by God to rule, because the prior events that led up to his accession were "disposed by the superior, tho' unseen, hand of Almighty Providence."<sup>153</sup> In George's case, the "glorious Revolution" was undeniable evidence of the "superintendency of Divine Providence" that put George on the throne.<sup>154</sup> More importantly, George's accession was evidence of God's love, because, "wise and good rulers are a signal mark of the divine love and favour to any Nation."<sup>155</sup> Potter thus urged his audience to rejoice in the knowledge that their king was placed on the throne by divine providence, and that God had chosen a wise and good king because of his love of the pious English populace. The Presbyterian John Evans offered further motivation for subjects to celebrate their new king as evidence of God's blessing, including that "everything remain(ed) in the same happy situation, as if nothing had changed."<sup>156</sup>

As George was the biological son of the previous king and was neither a newcomer to Britain, nor had he taken the throne by show of force, Potter and other clergymen were freed from the task of proving the new king's right to the crown. Instead they described the ideal relationship between sovereign and subject that would ensure a successful and prosperous reign for the king and queen consort. This relationship was mutually beneficial. The king and his government provided for the happiness of the people and in return, the people loved and

---

<sup>153</sup> John Potter, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Coronation of King George II and Queen Caroline* (London, 1727), 3.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>156</sup> John Evans, *The King and his faithful Subjects rejoicing in God; and the mouths of liars stopped: A Sermon Preached at Hand-Alley, October 15th 1727, Upon the occasion of their Majesties Coronation* (London, 1727).

supported the king. Potter reminded George that he must protect his people from both "private and publick" wrongs, and that Government was created to "order and dispose each Society." He likewise reminded George's subjects that "all those Benefits, which usually accrue to men from living together in Society, are the true ends of Society."<sup>157</sup> H. Smith, Rector of Weybridge argued that supreme power was appointed by God "for the benefit of human Society, and for supporting Men in the quiet Possession and Enjoyment of their Own."<sup>158</sup> W. Curtis, Minister of Harwich in Essex urged his flock to unite in their shared joy on the occasion, "and in so Religious and unanimous a Joy, we can do no less than approach one another in Amity and Love; let a Sense of our common Mercies and united Interests makes us kindly *affectionated*."<sup>159</sup> The king ensured the strength and health of the community; and a tranquil community benefited everyone.

The importance of community was a theme shared by all sermons published to commemorate George's coronation. One of the most important ways to ensure a strong community was through mutual affection. George was most deserving of his people's love because he was to provide for a strong national Protestant community. Further, as Potter noted, it was George whom they had "long been accustom'd to love and reverence, not only for those Virtues, which with his Imperial Crown and Dignity, he inherits from his Royal Father, but for the many other Princely Qualities peculiar to himself."<sup>160</sup> The people were to love George, not

---

<sup>157</sup> Potter, 18.

<sup>158</sup> H. Smith, *The Authority of Princes and the Obedience of Subjects: Consider'd in a Sermon Preach'd at Weybridge in Surry, on the Occasion of Their Majesties Happy Coronation* (London, 1727), 4.

<sup>159</sup> W. Curtis, *The Security and Tryumph of True Religion and Piety, over the open Idolatry and Secret False Worship. A Sermon* (Ipswich, 1727), 39.

<sup>160</sup> Potter, 24.



only for being the progeny of his father (who was uniformly praised), but for his own individual qualities as well.

As further evidence of George's worthiness of his subjects' affections, Potter pointed out that they already knew George. He had lived in England since his father's arrival in 1714. As Prince of Wales, he had made the ceremonial entry with his father. Potter thus concluded that, "It is with intire joy and satisfaction, that every man who truly loves our Native Country, beholds a Prince lineally descended from a long race of great Progenitors...but [also] that which hath universally, and almost beyond any former example, endear'd him to his people, is their persuasion, that his *heart* is *intirely* theirs."<sup>161</sup> Echoing the king's own words, Potter counseled a sort of intimacy with the king. Not only were the British people to love the king as they did their country, but also to love the king because he loved them in return. This reciprocity was present in the rhetoric of previous reigns, but it became especially pronounced in 1727.

George's subjects had many reasons to celebrate, and it was therefore their duty to not only be loyal, affectionate and perform their happiness, but they must also genuinely feel it. Curtis provided his congregation with an "undeniable Maxim": "that in Proportion to the Excellency of any Government, and the Purity of any Religion, so ought every sincere Member and Friend of either to enlarge their Hearts with Praise for its Preservation and Protection, and Prayer for the Continuance of its Well-being; and hence *is Sprung up a Light for the Righteous, and joyful gladness for all such as are true hearted.*"<sup>162</sup> Sincere emotion thus became an important duty for loyal subjects. It was no longer enough to act happy in the accession of the

---

<sup>161</sup> Potter, 24-25.

<sup>162</sup> W. Curtis, *The Security and Tryumph of True Religion and Piety, over the open Idolatry and Secret False Worship. A Sermon* (Ipswich, 1727), 13-14.

monarch, but proper loyalty required actually *feeling* happy. Sincere affection was the only means to ensure complete loyalty, both to God and king.

As Parliament gained power, clergymen increasingly emphasized that the king ruled with the people, not over them. William was presented as a monarch who would protect the people and their rights. Though his personal character was held up as exemplary, the people were to follow his lead, not lead with him. Anne was also lauded as the protector of Protestantism, whose piety would work for the good of her subjects. George, whose character was a matter of some debate, was again held up as the great defender of Protestants and their rights. George II was worthy of love because of his own *sincere* affection for his people.

Though coronation sermons grew shorter beginning in 1702, they became more accessible as sermons preached around the country to celebrate the coronation were printed. The reading (or listening) public was no longer restricted to the message preached from Westminster Abbey. As coronation sermons proliferated, their message became, on the whole, more accessible. Rather than consisting of lengthy diatribes promoting fear and reverence of the monarch, preachers sought a more friendly approach to loyalty. They focused on what was to be gained when the nation unified in support of the crown. Amidst party rivalries and Jacobite threats, preachers urged the people to unite in their love of the crown and one another.

## VI. Conclusion

One of the questions this project seeks to shed light on is to what extent monarchs and their courts influenced political discourse. This study of celebrations surrounding successive accessions offers no clear-cut answer. But perhaps this is because there is no clear-cut answer. Rather than showing any single actor in the shaping of eighteenth century political culture, the

analysis above illustrates the ways in which the court and the crowd influenced one another. I posit that it was in the reign of Anne that social and political imperatives lay the foundation for the emotive political culture of the later eighteenth century. Anne was presented as a nursing mother who kept her subjects close to her heart, and her court offered familial love as the solution to party rivalries.<sup>163</sup> Her subjects responded in addresses of congratulations that referenced Anne's own words and declaring their own affection for her English heart. Anne's successor expressed few emotions himself, but was congratulated with often similar language to his predecessor. I argue that the fact that the public continued to use affective language referencing their own hearts suggests that Anne's influence extended beyond her reign. Anne effectively - though not single-handedly - brought affective language into the political arena. As I discussed in chapter two, this was likely influenced by new ideas about the virtue of emotions in intellectual circles.

Though George I was not himself emotive, he was met with political rhetoric imbued with affective motivations. His son embraced this rhetoric, openly declaring his love for his people, which he received from them in return. As has been well-explored by Hannah Smith, Marilyn Morris and Andrew Thompson, the Hanoverians capitalized on their abundant family and secure dynasty. To some extent, the first Hanoverian monarchs created a new style of monarchy that emphasized familial bonds; however, they were not the first monarchs to employ familial language in efforts to build legitimacy. Englishmen had often referred to their monarch in parental terms, but it was in the early eighteenth century that familial love was presented as a solution to a divided nation.

---

<sup>163</sup> Kevin Sharpe argues that the sermons given to commemorate Anne's coronation reflect the words and wishes of the queen herself. Idem, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013).

## CHAPTER FIVE

### ROYAL MARRIAGE IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

Shortly before one o'clock in the afternoon of February 10, 1840, Queen Victoria processed from Buckingham Palace to the Chapel Royal where she married Prince Albert. After their nuptials, the queen and her consort then processed to Windsor. According to John Plunkett, this wedding represented a departure from the tradition of royal weddings that had, up to this point, taken place in the evening, and was thus "part of a movement towards royal populism."<sup>1</sup> But it simultaneously highlighted the inherent conflict in royal marriages, by drawing into question whether it was a "personal romantic event or a state occasion."<sup>2</sup> This chapter will show that royal marriages were not, in fact, personal romantic events, but political maneuvers. Funerals and coronations marked the transition from one reign to the next. Weddings extended the dynasty, both to other countries and to the next generation. While funerals and coronations were based to varying degrees on precedent, royal wedding ceremonies were planned to suit the political and ideological necessities of the time.

Seven royal marriages took place between 1661 and 1760.<sup>3</sup> Each was celebrated in a way that suited the current political climate and each demonstrates an unsteady progress towards making royal weddings public state occasions. Charles II's wedding in 1661 took place outside the capital in a private ceremony (or two). The last wedding in this study, that of Princess Mary

---

<sup>1</sup> John Plunkett, *Queen Victoria: First Media Monarch* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2003), 30.

<sup>2</sup> Plunkett, 32.

<sup>3</sup> I am deliberately excluding James II's marriage to Anne Hyde in 1660.

to Prince Frederick of Hesse-Kassel in 1740, was laid open for the public in the *Gazette*, despite the groom's absence. On the whole, Hanoverians chose to celebrate their nuptials in front of the elite, while the last Stuarts held private, sometimes secret affairs out of public view. These changes were partially the result of political circumstance. Clandestine marriages had created problems for the later Stuarts. It seems the Hanoverians learned from the failings of their predecessors. In creating political alliances through very public marriages, the Hanoverians showed the British public that ruling was very much a family affair. They used weddings as opportunities to promote loyalty to the crown in similar ways to those discussed in previous chapters. Weddings also provided the court occasions to instruct the public on proper marriage for the individual and the community.

As in the previous two chapters, I will first discuss the ceremonies themselves and what, if any, press coverage they received. I will then illustrate the very different ways in which the public responded to these ceremonies. Though public response was often covered by the court-controlled *London Gazette*, the same paper responsible for disseminating news and details of royal weddings to the public, the type of response the newspaper printed shifted drastically over the period, showing a shift from popular to elite commemorations. The Hanoverians opted to highlight the more refined addresses of the elite, rather than the bonfires and other public celebrations favored by the late Stuarts. The chapter will then turn to the ideal emotions prescribed for married couples in printed sermons and advice literature. Love was an ideal throughout the period, but it was widely understood that royal marriages were not founded in affection. Instead, Hanoverians used weddings as opportunities to exhibit the king's paternal affection for the nation, and elicit support from their subjects. The king's paternal affection for

his people was displayed in the forming of advantageous political bonds. Simultaneously, the royal family was promoted as a model of virtue and illustrated the proper form of marriage.

### I. Seven Royal Weddings, 1661-1740

In a 1981 article written to commemorate the marriage of Prince Charles and Lady Diana Spencer, Richard Mullen noted that, prior to 1863, "royal marriages had been held at St. James's Palace, and usually at night with little emphasis on ceremonial and even less on public participation."<sup>4</sup> While it is true that most members of the royal family who were married in England celebrated their nuptials at St. James's Palace, the level of ceremonial and public participation increased from the period between 1660 and 1740. At the beginning of the period, it was by no means necessary that royalty be married at St. James's, or that marriages take place in a church. In 1663, Charles' illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth was married in a ceremony that took place in the king's bedchamber.<sup>5</sup> Charles himself was married in Portsmouth.

Charles II married the Portuguese Princess, Catherine of Braganza in two ceremonies. One was a proxy marriage conducted in Lisbon on April 23, 1662, and the other took place in Portsmouth on May 21, 1662, following the princess' arrival.<sup>6</sup> Despite the bride's Catholicism, the English ceremony was a Protestant one, conducted by the Dean of the Chapel Royal and Bishop of London, Gilbert Sheldon.<sup>7</sup> According to Anna Keay, the Protestant ceremony was

---

<sup>4</sup> Richard Mullen, "The Last Wedding of a Prince of Wales, 1863," *History Today* 31 (June 1981), 12.

<sup>5</sup> Anna Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (London: Continuum U.K., 2008), 101.

<sup>6</sup> John Ashdown-Hill, *Royal Marriage Secrets: Consorts & Concubines, Bigamists & Bastards* (The History Press, 2013), 158; Keay, 123. According to S.M. Wynne, Charles and Catherine had two ceremonies in Portsmouth, a "private" Catholic ceremony and a "public" Anglican one: S. M. Wynne, "Catherine (1638–1705)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.flagship.luc.edu/view/article/4894>, accessed Jan 4, 2017].

<sup>7</sup> Keay, 123.

agreed upon to ensure the legitimacy of any future children.<sup>8</sup> The marriage in Portsmouth was attended by the bride, groom and two witnesses.

Though the marriage was conducted outside the capital and in relative privacy, the new queen was presented to London in a water procession on August 23.<sup>9</sup> This procession included a series of entertainments throughout the city, consisting of short pageants and songs performed for the royal couple. A published account of these performances suggests they were orchestrated to express the people's joy for their sovereign's marriage.<sup>10</sup>

Charles' brother James had a penchant for unpopular marriages. He married twice, first to a commoner, and later to a Catholic. His first marriage to Anne Hyde, the Lord Chancellor's daughter in 1660 was conducted in secret and widely criticized upon its discovery. The king remedied this by dining with the newlyweds in public, after which, newspapers reported the union as having received the royal approval.<sup>11</sup> Two years after Anne's death in 1671, James married his second wife, Mary of Modena. The marriage was concluded after months of deliberation, and before official papal dispensation was received for the Catholic couple.<sup>12</sup> James and the Princess were hastily married through a proxy ceremony prior to the bride's arrival in England in 1673. Upon Mary's arrival in Dover, the Bishop of Oxford read the marriage contract which had been agreed upon at the proxy marriage on September 30, 1673. This public reading was perhaps in lieu of a wedding ceremony. There was no ceremony in England, because

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Kevin Sharpe, 163.

<sup>10</sup> John Tatham, *Aqua triumphalis, being a true relation of the honourable the city of Londons entertaining Their Sacred Majesties upon the river of Thames* (London, 1662).

<sup>11</sup> Keay, 141.

<sup>12</sup> John Miller, *James II* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978, reprint 2000), 73.

Parliament was attempting to challenge the match and James did not want to make way for any questions of the validity of the original union.<sup>13</sup> Even before Mary's arrival in England, Parliament had drawn up a bill to prevent the newlyweds from consummating their union.<sup>14</sup> James' marriage was not announced in the *Gazette*. This was likely because his bride was Catholic, and the match was controversial to say the least.

Though unpopular, the match did elicit one published poem. In 1673, an anonymous poet celebrated Mary of Modena, who, "Attracted by Chast Love's Charms," traveled to England to marry the Duke of York.<sup>15</sup> The poem praised Mary's chastity. It paints Mary's travels from Modena to England as a journey guided by virtuous "love" - Mary leaving hordes of jealous Europeans in her wake.<sup>16</sup> As publication still required a license from the court, it is quite possible that this poem was intended to soften public opinion of the match. The court's silence on James' marriage served to both distance the king from his brother's unpopular choice as well as to avoid drawing further attention to the politically contentious issue of the heir apparent's Catholic bride.

The next Stuart marriage proved much more popular, by design. Charles negotiated the marriage contract for his eldest niece, Mary to wed the Stadtholder of the Dutch Republic, William of Orange in 1677. Like most other marriages in this study, this was a union of political expedience. Mary's father James wanted her to marry the French dauphin, which would

---

<sup>13</sup> Martin Haile, *Queen Mary of Modena: Her Life and Letters* (London, 1905), 40-41. Martin Haile appears to have been the pseudonym used by Marie Halle, according to: James Kennedy, W.A. Smith, and A.F. Johnson, *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature, Vol. 4* (New York, NY: Haskell House Publishers, Ltd., 1971), 29.

<sup>14</sup> Miller, *James II*, 74.

<sup>15</sup> Anon., *A congratulatory epithalium, or speech on the arrival of Her Royal Highness, and happy marriage to the most illustrious Prince James, Duke of York* (London, 1673).

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.



strengthen ties to France and require Mary to convert to Catholicism. The king, however, insisted that the princess' marriage strengthen Protestant ties, so William, a Lutheran and England's strongest ally against the growing power of France, was chosen to be the groom.<sup>17</sup> William traveled to London in early October 1677, accompanied by an entourage arranged by the king.<sup>18</sup> According to records kept by Sir Charles Cottrell, Charles' Master of Ceremonies, William was in London 10 or 12 days before the marriage was declared, "upon which their Royal Highnesses rec(eive)d the general joy of all the nation in congratulations from the Kings Privy Council, from the 12 Judges, as the Body of the Law, & from the Lord Mayor, the two Sheriffs & courts of Aldermen, as from the whole City."<sup>19</sup> The young Mary reportedly wept at the prospect of the union with a much older man, which was bound to take her away from her homeland.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, William and Mary were wed in St. James's Palace by the Bishop of London, Henry Compton at night on November 4, 1677, about a fortnight after the marriage agreement was announced.<sup>21</sup> James' wife was expected to go into labor any minute, so Charles II allegedly "begged" Compton to "make haste with the Ceremony lest his sister should be delivered of a son in the meantime and so spoil the marriage."<sup>22</sup> Cottrell reported that the marriage was

---

<sup>17</sup> Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980), 16-17.

<sup>18</sup> TNA, LC 5/2, 100.

<sup>19</sup> TNA, LC 5/2, 101.

<sup>20</sup> Gregg, 34. These supposed tears were not ones of joy.

<sup>21</sup> *LG*, Nov. 5-8, 1677.

<sup>22</sup> Edgar Sheppard, *Memorials of St. James's Palace*, Vol II (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1894), 44-45.

"consummated, so privately as there were none as I am informed present, but the King, the Duke (of York) & Bishop of London, who married them."<sup>23</sup>

Newspaper coverage of the "privately celebrated" marriage of William and Mary in 1677 focused primarily on accounts of the public celebrations in response. Chester reported the "acclamations of Joy" the news of the marriage inspired. The Mayor of Chester "caused the Bells to be rung, and Bonfires to be made, which was accompanied by the firing of the great Guns and all other demonstrations of joy this place was capable of."<sup>24</sup> Likewise, Plymouth reported the city celebrated the match with guns, bells, bonfires, "and all other Expressions of Joy we were able to make."<sup>25</sup> In each instance, the town did not report these "expressions of joy" as events arranged spontaneously by the town's inhabitants, but as events deliberately orchestrated by members of the town's government. The same issue reported that the King, Queen, Duke and Duchess of York, as well as the bride and groom all received the congratulations of ambassadors residing at the court and the Mayor and Aldermen of London. The *Gazette* did not print these addresses as it did on other occasions.<sup>26</sup> The following issue announced that Mary's stepmother had given birth to a son. As the potential heir to the throne, the birth may have detracted somewhat from the publicity of the marriage of James' eldest daughter. However, the English public had not yet become obsessed with addressing in the way that would become apparent in later reigns.

---

<sup>23</sup> TNA, LC 5/2, 101. Cottrell does not indicate whether "consummate" here refers to the wedding ceremony itself, or the act of sexually consummating the marriage. Accounts from the *London Gazette*, Nov. 5-8, 1677 offer no clarity on the matter. The October 26th report from Plymouth stated that the marriage had been "concluded", while report from Chester, dated October 27th, stated that the marriage was "intended."

<sup>24</sup> *LG*, Nov. 5-8, 1677. This report from Chester was dated October 27.

<sup>25</sup> *LG*, Nov. 5-8, 1677. This report from Plymouth was dated October 26.

<sup>26</sup> *LG*, Nov. 5-8, 1677.

Princess Anne's marriage in 1683 was not nearly as popular as her sister's, likely because it was arranged at the behest of Louis XIV.<sup>27</sup> Negotiations for Anne's marriage began in early 1683, likely expedited by rumors that she had been seduced by one of Charles' favorites.<sup>28</sup> According to Gregg, both Charles and Louis XIV sought a match with George, Prince of Denmark, because such would create a powerful naval alliance against Louis' enemy, the Dutch. Sir Thomas Clarges reported that both Charles and James received "great satisfaction" from the match.<sup>29</sup> One court observer noted of George's arrival at Whitehall that no one "could please better or more universally in one afternoon than he hath done," at court.<sup>30</sup> The prince arrived on the heels of the Duke of Monmouth who had been to Denmark to negotiate the marriage as well as to attend "councils of war."<sup>31</sup> It is likely for this reason that Anne's marriage to George of Denmark in July 1683, was conducted without much fanfare. The *Gazette* announced that the marriage was "celebrated" in the evening at St. James's with the Bishop of London. Cottrell recorded that "Their Majesties, Their Royal Highnesses, & the chiefest of the Nobility" attended the ceremony.<sup>32</sup> Following the ceremony, the couple dined with king and queen.<sup>33</sup> However, the public was given very few details of the ceremony or the celebrations of the evening. The

---

<sup>27</sup> Gilbert Burnett, *Bishop Burnett's History of his own time* (London, 1724-34), 386-87. Burnet speaks for the nation, here, but there was no resounding outcry against the match. It seems likely that Burnet speaks for himself and his fellow Whigs. The extent of the public's knowledge of the reasons behind the match is unclear.

<sup>28</sup> Gregg, 27, 32-33. Gregg concludes that the rumors were false based on the favorite, Lord Mulgrave's later success at court.

<sup>29</sup> *HMC Laing* I, 434.

<sup>30</sup> *HMC Seventh Report*, Part I, 365: O. Wynne to Lord Preston, July 19, 1683.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> TNA, LC 5/2, 144.

<sup>33</sup> TNA, LC 5/2, 144. The word "shirt" in this account is unclear. It could also be "skirt." These records were copied by Sir R. Chester, the Master of Ceremonies in 1830.

relative silence on the occasion of Anne's marriage could also be the result of her distance from the throne. She was the younger daughter of the heir to the throne and her accession would require both her father and sister to die childless before her, at least in theory.

Later Stuart marriages were private occasions, the details of which were largely concealed from the public. Those that received more attention, however, were treated so out of political expediency. James' unpopular marriages were conducted well out of public view and Anne's was certainly not publicized. Charles was a sitting monarch when he married, yet his ceremony was held outside of the capital and in relative secrecy. Mary and William's marriage in 1677 received considerably more attention than her sister's because the marriage was considered a triumph for the king. The court knew the Protestant union would be welcomed by the masses (or at least, the political elites) who feared popish influence. The private nature of these marriages represented, among other things, a court that did not see it as necessary or useful to lay open their private lives to their subjects. The failures of the Stuart dynasty would perhaps prove a useful lesson to its successor.

After Anne Stuart's private marriage in 1683, 51 years passed before another royal marriage took place in England. Both Anne and Mary died childless and the crown went to their cousin, George I, who brought with him a secure and plentiful dynasty. His son, later George II, was married at the time of George I's succession, and already had four children. The next royal wedding to take place in England was in the reign of George II, when his eldest daughter married yet another Prince of Orange. This 51-year gap between royal weddings resulted in a vast change in the style of royal weddings.

Unlike those of her predecessors, George II's eldest daughter's marriage to Prince William IV of Orange was celebrated in a "magnificent manner," at St. James's Palace.<sup>34</sup> At seven o'clock at night on March 14, 1734, the groom and his attendants, including the Duke of Grafton (the Lord Chamberlain) and other members of the upper nobility, assembled in the Great Council Chamber, and the bride assembled her ten ladies in the Great Drawing Room, while the king and queen assembled in the King's Lesser Drawing Room. The groups then processed separately into the French Chapel, which was decorated with velvet, gold and silver tissue, and other lavish ornaments.<sup>35</sup> The couple knelt at the altar, where they were married by the Bishop of London and listened to an anthem by Handel. Afterwards, they returned down the aisle in a procession accompanied, again by drums and trumpets, and in specific order of precedence.<sup>36</sup> A gallery was built that connected the French Chapel to the King's apartments via the Palace Garden. According to Sheppard, this gallery was built specifically for the purpose and could hold up to 4,000 people.<sup>37</sup> The gallery and the service was lit and guarded by 3,000 guards on duty.<sup>38</sup> The etching produced by William Kent (who was also in charge of the chapel decorations), portrays the service in the French Chapel and depicts the chapel brimming with

---

<sup>34</sup> Sheppard, *Memorials of St. James's Palace*, 363.

<sup>35</sup> Sheppard, Vol. II, 68-69; Andrew C. Thompson, *George II* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 110. According to Thompson, the French Chapel is what is now known as the Queen's Chapel. I note that a contemporary depiction of the venue designated it the *Capella Regia*. Also see figure 1 below.

<sup>36</sup> Sheppard, 70, 366.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 367.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

spectators.<sup>39</sup> Following the chapel service and processions, the couple dined with the king and queen in public in the State Ball Room.<sup>40</sup>

This ceremony was recounted in detail the *Gazette* and other papers.<sup>41</sup> Other papers reported on the gossip-worthy elements of the event. The *Grub Street Journal* included no detail of the procession or the rite itself, but that the groom had his pocket picked at some point during the celebration, and that the king "put on [the groom's] shirt with his own hands," the Prince of Wales undressed him, and the lace on the wedding sheets cost 1,200£.<sup>42</sup>

According to P. Geyl, the English government regretted the match before the marriage itself had even taken place. He argues that the match "irritated" the States of Holland during a time when England needed the support of the Dutch Republic to remain out of the war over the Polish succession. When Horace Walpole traveled to the Dutch republic in 1734, he informed Anne that "he did what he could to make people forget the marriage."<sup>43</sup> Geyl claims that Anne was greatly disappointed by her government's attitude to her marriage, however, her wedding received more attention than her brother's.

Two years later, Frederick, Prince of Wales wed Princess Augusta of Saxe-Gotha in the evening of April 27, 1736. The *Gazette's* account of the occasion was "short & general."<sup>44</sup> The *Gazette* stated only that the ceremony had been conducted at the Chapel Royal "with the greatest

---

<sup>39</sup> William Kent, *The wedding of Princess Anne and William of Orange in the Chapel of St James's as decorated by William Kent, on 14 March 1734*, etching, 1734, British Museum, London.

<sup>40</sup> Sheppard, 367.

<sup>41</sup> *London Evening Post*, March 14-16, 1733/4.

<sup>42</sup> *Grub Street Journal*, March 21, 1734.

<sup>43</sup> P. Geyl, "William IV of Orange and his English Marriage," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 8 (1925): 21.

<sup>44</sup> Lambeth MS 1130/1, f. 46r.

magnificence and splendor."<sup>45</sup> The *London Magazine* provided a bit more detail. It reported that upon her arrival in St. James', the princess was received by the king and queen "with extream Tenderness." It also related that the union was solemnized by the Bishop of London and "proclaim'd to the People by the firing of Guns."<sup>46</sup> Smith concludes that the relative paucity of grandeur at Frederick's wedding was because he had fallen from his father's good graces.<sup>47</sup> By this measure, it would seem Princess Anne was George's favorite. However, while we cannot be certain that Frederick's wedding was less grand than his sister's two years prior, the *Gazette* dedicated the majority of a three-page issue to a detailed account of Anne's wedding, whereas a short paragraph was deemed sufficient to cover Frederick's nuptials.<sup>48</sup>

In May 1740, Princess Mary wed Prince Frederick of Hesse-Kassel. This wedding was unusual in that the groom was not present for the ceremony. Because the prince could not travel to England, the couple were married in a proxy ceremony on the evening of May 8. The groom's absence did not prevent the court from putting on a full ceremony, with a procession in which the Duke of Cumberland, the bride's brother, stood in for the groom. Two days before the ceremony, the court announced that there was to be a drawing room at St. James' at seven in the evening, "the Espousals....being then to be solemnized in the Royal Chapel there."<sup>49</sup> This announcement was specifically addressed to the nobility and gentry, and was thus an open invitation to any able

---

<sup>45</sup> *LG*, April 27 - May 1, 1736.

<sup>46</sup> *London Magazine*, April 1736, 218.

<sup>47</sup> Smith, 202.

<sup>48</sup> *LG*, April 27 - May 1, 1736.

<sup>49</sup> *LG*, May 3-6, 1740.

to attend court, to be present for the ceremony. Despite the lack of bridegroom, this ceremony was the court sought to make this ceremony open to the political elite.

The *Gazette's* coverage of this event was quite different from either the full account of Princess Anne's wedding 1733/4 or of Prince Frederick's in 1736. The *Gazette* was extended to seven pages to allow not only for a detailed description of the procession itself, but it also included the text of the procuration letter (in Latin), which gave the Duke of Cumberland the authority to stand in place of the groom, but also the vows taken by each party.<sup>50</sup> The Duke of Newcastle, the King's principal secretary of state, read the letter "publicly."<sup>51</sup> The issue also included a lengthy speech and benediction given by the Archbishop of Canterbury following the exchange of rings. An anthem by Handel concluded the ceremony, although he pieced together parts of previous works, rather than composing a wholly-new work.<sup>52</sup> The wedding party then processed to the King's little drawing room.<sup>53</sup>

Mary's wedding in 1740 is unusual for several reasons. First, it was the first royal proxy wedding since James II married Mary of Modena in 1673, and, unlike James' marriage, the public was given full details of the nuptials. King George certainly had his reasons for insisting on a proxy ceremony. First, according to Andrew Thompson, the king desired to solidify the match speedily. George sought to marry his daughter to the hereditary Prince because he hoped the connection would dissuade the Germans from sending military support to France. The Prince's father, William of Hesse-Kassel was merely the regent for his elder brother Frederick I,

---

<sup>50</sup> *LG*, May 6-10, 1740.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> Thompson, 133. Though Thompson does not suggest it, Handel's choice to use existing compositions may have been driven by the haste with which the marriage was performed.

<sup>53</sup> *LG*, May 6-10, 1740.



King of Sweden. Traditionally, the Swiss had closer ties to the French than the English, and George hoped to prevent Hessian military forces being sent to aid the French.<sup>54</sup> George also had reservations about sending his daughter to Kassel unmarried.<sup>55</sup>

The fact that the Letter of Procuration and the Archbishop's speech were both printed in Latin, suggests an educated target audience. It also lent a certain authority to the marriage. Additional testament of the marriage's validity was provided by the signatures of 72 elite witnesses, including the Duke of Marlborough and Horace Walpole, which were included in the *Gazette's* coverage of the occasion.<sup>56</sup>

What had once been a largely private affair became yet another occasion for the monarchy to promote its power and legitimacy. Princess Anne, much like Anne Stuart, was not thought to be a real contender for the throne. As the younger daughter of the heir apparent, Anne Stuart's wedding was hardly mentioned by the court. However, her claim to the throne was not so different from that of George's eldest daughter Princess Anne. Both princesses had an elder sibling that stood between them and the crown.<sup>57</sup> So, why was the 1683 marriage presented so differently in the press than that of Princess Anne in 1733/4?

The drastic change in approaches to royal nuptials under the Hanoverians might be explained by the court traditions the family brought with them from Germany. However, George II's wedding to Caroline of Ansbach in 1705 does not appear to have been a grand affair. The

---

<sup>54</sup> Thompson, 133.

<sup>55</sup> Thompson, 133.

<sup>56</sup> *LG*, May 6-10, 1740.

<sup>57</sup> Anne Stuart's elder sister Mary was ahead of her in the succession, and the Prince of Wales stood between George II's eldest daughter, Anne and the throne. Because the line of succession favored male children, the latter Anne's younger brother, William would have also been ahead of her in line.

wedding was hurried to avoid potential problems created by jealous (failed) suitors, but its speed required the suspension of court mourning for Georg Wilhelm, who had died less than a week prior to Caroline's arrival in Hanover.<sup>58</sup> The couple was married in the Herrenhausen chapel in the evening of Caroline's arrival on September 2, 1705. A ball was held the next night.<sup>59</sup> English newspapers reported the following day that the marriage had taken place, with "publick Rejoicings".<sup>60</sup>

The private nature of earlier weddings might also be a reaction to suspicions surround big, public weddings. Gillis suggests that big weddings were seen as Catholic relics. In the early seventeenth century, reformers discouraged the practice. Aside from the period of civil marriage (1653-1660) during the commonwealth, efforts to quash big public weddings were largely unsuccessful. According to Gillis, the practice helped communities celebrate milestones and build bonds.<sup>61</sup> As public weddings were also the norm amongst the lower classes, private weddings created more distance between the royal family and the rabble. The decision to make royal weddings private affairs was likely just as much a political move for the late Stuarts as it was for the early Hanoverians.

Despite the vast difference in royal weddings between the Stuarts and Hanoverians, historians have lumped them together as "private" occasions. The main factor that seems to mark the difference between public and private weddings in historians' estimations is the timing of the ceremony itself. Victoria's wedding is seen as the first public royal wedding because it took place

---

<sup>58</sup> William Henry Wilkins, *Caroline, the Illustrious Queen Consort of George II*, Vol I (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1901), 57; Thompson, 30.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> *LG*, Sept. 3-6, 1705.

<sup>61</sup> Gillis, Ch. 2.

in the afternoon, whereas those before it were evening events. This presupposes a modern conception of the night time. Craig Koslofsky's study of the early modern relationship to night and darkness shows that royal celebrations throughout Europe had been shifting towards the night since the fifteenth century, and this shift "quickened in the seventeenth."<sup>62</sup> The choice of nighttime for court celebrations was not intended to obscure the proceedings, but to provide a dramatic backdrop against which candles and fireworks were made more awe-inspiring. Though such public displays were not always used to commemorate royal weddings, placing celebrations at night was part of what Koslofsky calls the "nocturnalization of daily life at court."<sup>63</sup> Night had become a "legitimate social part of the day," therefore, celebrating a wedding at night made it part of the court's social calendar.<sup>64</sup>

Hanoverian weddings were much less private than those of the Stuarts. The events themselves included more participants and spectators, and the details of the ceremony were printed for an even larger audience. Increased visibility of royal weddings was a response to growing social and political anxiety surrounding secret unions. Rumors of secret marriages had occasionally plagued the monarchy since at least Charles II's reign. His alleged marriage to his mistress, Lucy Walters, created problems for the king as he neared the end of his reign. Lucy bore Charles' illegitimate son in (or around) 1649.<sup>65</sup> In 1680, Charles published a pamphlet

---

<sup>62</sup> Craig Koslofsky, *Evening's Empire: A History of the Night in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 97. Koslofsky cites Richard Alewyn who argued "the transition from Renaissance to Baroque" was the "decisive phase" in the court's move from day to night, in Idem, *Das große Welttheater: Die Epoch der höfischen Feste 2e* (Munich: Beck, 1985), 37-39.

<sup>63</sup> Koslofsky, 110.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Ronald Hutton, *Charles II, King of England, Scotland and Ireland* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1989), 25. According to Hutton, Monmouth's birth date was given in an unreliable political pamphlet, so we cannot be completely certain of its veracity.

denying his marriage to Walters, which he claimed was only a rumor spread with "great Industry and Malice," by "some Men of a Seditious and restless Spirit."<sup>66</sup> Had the rumors gained enough momentum, they could have destabilized the Stuart dynasty. The rumor of a clandestine royal marriage was a useful tool for those who objected to Charles' heir apparent, his Catholic brother James. If Charles had indeed married Lucy Walters in secret before his marriage to Catherine, this would have made the Duke of Monmouth the king's legitimate son and heir to the throne. The Hanoverians took steps to prevent any such attempts to delegitimize their authority. However, this did not mean the end of clandestine royal marriages. According to John Ashdown-Hill, in the late eighteenth century, after the rise and fall of many rumors alleging secret marriages, "the need for documentary evidence was...accepted."<sup>67</sup>

Clandestine marriages were not merely problems for the monarchy. The form of marriage was not set in stone in the late seventeenth century. Following the abolition of civil marriage at the Restoration, licenses were once again made a legal alternative to the calling of banns that required the community to be made aware of the planned nuptials of any couple. This meant that it was possible for a couple to be married in relative secrecy, although witnesses and a clergyman were still required. Historians of marriage have seen the period as one of great abuse of the system, resulting in bigamy and a slew of clandestine marriages concluded without parental consent.<sup>68</sup> Rebecca Probert has recently concluded that clandestine marriages were not as widespread as previously supposed and, in fact, most marriages adhered to canon law out of fear

---

<sup>66</sup> *His Majesties declaration to all his loving subjects, June the second, 1680* (London, 1680).

<sup>67</sup> Ashdown-Hill, 190.

<sup>68</sup> See especially, Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage*; Gillis, *For Better For Worse*.

that the marriage could be questioned at a later date.<sup>69</sup> Regardless, whether bigamy and clandestine unions were as popular as previously supposed or not, the anxiety over such marriages was expressed by divines throughout the period.

In the seventeenth century, ecclesiastical lawyer Henry Swinburne laid out the distinction between public and private marriages. Public marriages were those observed by "sufficient Witnesses, and wherein are observed all other Solemnities requisite by the ecclesiastical law." Private or "clandestine" marriages were those that took place unobserved by witnesses.<sup>70</sup> More than a century after Swinburne's death, clandestine marriages remained a problem. In 1733/4, Samuel Wright used the occasion of Princess Anne's wedding to promote public nuptials:

the publick solemnizing of marriages with a prudent regard to circumstances, serves to promote many ends of business; and to kindle and cherish more good dispositions in general, than secret and concealed matches can do. Publickly owned and avowed marriages give the world much better notions of decorum, and order, and of the mutual and joyfull content if all parties concerned, than hidden and private attachments do<sup>71</sup>

Wright further urged that only those that married "religiously, or *in the Lord*," that is, in the church, would avoid "Vice and Folly."<sup>72</sup>

The Hanoverians' increased attention to this problem is further supported by the promulgation of the Marriages Act in 1753, which required marriages to be solemnized in an Anglican Church (except in the case of Jewish or Quaker unions), with at least two witnesses in

---

<sup>69</sup> Probert, "Marriage Act of 1753;" Eadem, *Marriage Law and Practice in the Long Eighteenth Century: A Reassessment* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

<sup>70</sup> Henry Swinburne, *A Treatis of spousals, or matrimonial contracts* (London, 1686). Swinburne died in 1624, the first edition of this work was not published until 1686. It was again published in 1711. Sheila Doyle, 'Swinburne, Henry (c.1551–1624)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.flagship.luc.edu/view/article/26836>, accessed 12 Feb 2017].

<sup>71</sup> Samuel Wright, *A Sermon on Marriage, preached at Black-Fryers, March 17, 1733/4* (London, 1733/4), 17.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

addition to the officiant, and entered into the parish register. The law also required the couple to obtain a bann or license prior to the marriage.<sup>73</sup> Probert points out that parts of this law were actually unnecessary. Banns had been required since the thirteenth century and licenses were introduced as an alternative in 1533.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, Probert argues, clandestine marriages, the law's declared target, were quite rare in most of the country. The one exception to this was, of course, London, where clandestine marriages mostly registered at Fleet prison. Mark Herber estimates half of the marriages celebrated in London in the 1740s were registered in an area that abided by the rules of the Fleet.<sup>75</sup> In the case of royal marriages, public declarations of the occasion provided insurance against dynastic challenges. If royal marriages were conducted in full public view, there could be no challenge to their authenticity.

The Hanoverians thus lay open what had once been a very private ceremony. According to John R. Gillis, at the same time that royal weddings were going public, for the "new middle class marriage became a family matter and the wedding a private affair."<sup>76</sup> On the other hand, public weddings had been the norm for the peasant and artisan classes for over a century. Public weddings "not only established the standards by which a marriage was to be governed, but mandated a public to enforce them."<sup>77</sup> In the case of royal weddings, publicity was insurance

---

<sup>73</sup> Rebecca Probert, "The Impact of the Marriage Act of 1753: Was it Really 'A Most Cruel Law for the Fair Sex'?", *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 38:2 (2005): 248.

<sup>74</sup> Probert, "Marriage Act of 1753," 248.

<sup>75</sup> Mark Herber, *Clandestine Marriages in the Chapel and Rules of the Fleet Prison 1680-1754* (London: Francis Boulte Publishers, 1998), 20. Cited in Probert, "Marriage Act of 1753," 249. Probert is skeptical of Herber's percentage, because many registries in the Fleet were duplicated in other parishes.

<sup>76</sup> John R. Gillis, *For Better, For Worse: British Marriages 1600 to the Present* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1985), 83.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid*, 81.

against dynastic challenges. They also provided an opportunity for the royal family to interact with their subjects and set the example of matrimony.

## II. Publicizing Consensus

Though they were not invited to the ceremonies, the public celebrated royal marriages both in action and print. They lit bonfires, fired guns, published poems and presented addresses. Just as the Hanoverians' approach to royal weddings differed from that of the later Stuarts, they also promoted different forms of celebration in the wider public. Later Stuart courts published accounts of bonfires, bells and other traditional celebrations throughout the realm, while some 50 years later, George II's court opted to highlight the elite well-wishing presented in addresses. This was yet another aspect of the court's changing relationship with the public. As weddings became bigger, more public affairs, the commemoration of them became more focused on elite ideals.

There was very little newspaper coverage of Charles II's marriage in 1661, but it was celebrated with the traditional bonfires and bells. The Earl of Mountrath (Ireland) told Charles' Secretary of State that the news of the king's engagement was met with "rejoicings ... manifested by" bells, bonfires, and "other expressions of joy," in which both Houses of Parliament had "a large show." Mountrath also related that the Irish Parliament had ordered the speeches given by the King and the Lord Chancellor to be published, because they did not want to keep "so great a satisfaction to themselves."<sup>78</sup> Speeches given in the Irish Parliament were published in *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, but the details of the civic celebrations of the match were not included

---

<sup>78</sup> TNA, SP 63/307/1, ff. 118 r-v.

in the newspaper. The same issue of the *Intelligencer* was largely consumed with accounts of the civic festivities observed around the kingdom in celebration of the king's birthday.<sup>79</sup>

James II's marriage in 1673 was not publicized and therefore received little attention from the public. However, his eldest daughter's marriage four years later was welcomed by the public. Communities throughout the country celebrated Mary and William's marriage with bonfires, bells, gunfire and toasts. Some of these celebrations received more detailed coverage in the court newspaper than others. The same issue of the *Gazette* that announced the completion of the marriage on the back page opened with a full column recounting the celebrations in Edinburgh, led by the Duke of Lauderdale, who immediately called a meeting of the Scottish Privy Council upon receiving news of the union. At this meeting, the councilors composed a congratulatory letter addressed to the king and planned a "solemnity" that was to commemorate the occasion. On October 29, the Duke, councillors and other members of the nobility processed on foot through the city accompanied by drums and trumpets. At the end of this procession, they drank the healths of William and Mary, James and his wife, Mary, and the king and queen (the newspaper recounts these in specific order), amidst fountains flowing with wine. The newspaper reported that all the people "were filled with a general Joy, since they first heard the happy News, which was then expressed by their loud and frequent Acclamations." In the evening, bonfires were lit around the city, including in the palace yard, and these bonfires were visited by magistrates, while the nobility retired to the palace.<sup>80</sup>

This lengthy account from Edinburgh is the most detailed one given for any celebration of William and Mary's wedding. This was likely staged in an attempt to boost the popularity of

---

<sup>79</sup> *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, June 10-17, 1661.

<sup>80</sup> *LG*, Nov. 5-8, 1677.



John Maitland, the Duke of Lauderdale, who was named (repeatedly) as the leader of these celebrations. In late 1677, Lauderdale's power at court and in the Scottish Parliament was slipping in response to the harsh measures he employed to seek out and quell dissent.<sup>81</sup> By 1677, he had been made "the virtual dictator of Scotland," but his power relied on continued royal support. In June 1678, Lauderdale's tactics were brought to Charles' notice and the Duke was required to travel to London to defend himself in person, which precipitated the end of his career.<sup>82</sup> Prior to his downfall, the marriage of the king's niece provided the perfect opportunity for Lauderdale to remind the king of his loyalty, even if it did not effectively raise him in the royal estimation. Stuart weddings provided yet another opportunity for courtiers and civic officials to display their loyalty in attempts to gain political favor for whatever ends their situations warranted.

As this news was dated October 30, these celebrations must have been a response to the conclusion of marriage negotiations, rather than the marriage itself. News from Plymouth and Chester was also dated late October, but reported that those towns celebrated the match with bells, bonfires, and gunfire. These celebrations were likely sparked by news of William's arrival in England and his official request to marry the princess, which he made to the king on October 17. Charles gave his consent, despite his brother's objections, on November 1.<sup>83</sup> The same newspaper included an account from The Hague that reported a meeting of the States General ordered that "a day be appointed for a general rejoycing throughout all these Provinces, that all

---

<sup>81</sup> Ronald Hutton, "Maitland, John, Duke of Lauderdale (1616–1682)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed, May 2006. [http://www.oxforddnb.com.flagship.luc.edu/view/article/17827, accessed January 5, 2017]

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Wout Troost, *William III, The Stadtholder King* (Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2005), 140-141.

people may have an opportunity of making a more solemn demonstration of that joy and satisfaction which is so visible in every Mans countenance and actions."<sup>84</sup> The court published these accounts in the *Gazette* to show the far-reaching support of the king's efforts to build political alliances that would aid the Protestant cause both at home and on the continent.

Around the time of Princess Anne's marriage in July 1683, the *Gazette* was largely consumed with addresses to the king celebrating the discovery of the Rye House plots and the king's escape from danger. The extent to which coverage of the conspiracy eclipsed coverage of the princess' nuptials is impossible to determine. Cottrell reports that the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London waited on the couple at St. James's to congratulate them two days after their marriage. The couple also received letters of congratulations from the Chancellor of Denmark.<sup>85</sup> The *Gazette* reported that the newlyweds then received "the Compliments and Congratulations of the Foreign Ministers residing at...Court," but did not provide details of the addresses made to the new couple.<sup>86</sup> If bonfires were lit for the princess' marriage, they were not reported in newspapers.

Reportage of local celebrations of royal marriages was meant to illustrate the public's support of the king's initiatives. Celebrations of the Charles' own marriage were covered only briefly in print, which may be evidence of further efforts to obscure his union, perhaps because of his bride's religion. This may also have been a product of the relative dearth of periodicals in publication in 1661. The only newspaper that reported on the celebrations, *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, was edited by the royalist Roger L'Estrange and therefore its coverage was

---

<sup>84</sup> *LG*, Nov. 5-8, 1677.

<sup>85</sup> TNA, LC 5/2, 145.

<sup>86</sup> *LG*, July 26-30, 1683.

undoubtedly intended to promote the interests of the crown.<sup>87</sup> In 1677, William and Mary's marriage was heralded from the front page of the *Gazette*, making it clear that the court not only wanted the public to know about the match, but that it was celebrated throughout the kingdom as well.

After Anne Stuart's relatively quiet marriage in 1683, fifty years lapsed before another royal wedding took place in England, and in that time, the court's approach to public celebration of royal weddings shifted away from the streets to the court. In 1733/4, while papers such as the *London Evening Post* reported that "the Rejoycings throughout London by all sorts of People was the greatest that was ever known, each striving to outvie the other in Loyalty and Respect," the official court paper reported primarily on elite declarations of loyalty.<sup>88</sup> In the *Gazette*, the civic celebrations marked by bonfires and bells gave way to congratulations and well-wishing presented by the elite. Of course, the court had many reasons to want to shift public celebrations away from the traditional bonfires and guns, most notably to quell the competition they ignited, especially amidst growing partisan tensions.<sup>89</sup> Rather than promoting the often unwieldy habit of exhibiting loyalty by setting things alight, the Hanoverians encouraged a more refined display in the form of polite addresses from aristocratic and political elites. Published addresses spread the court's ideal expressions of congratulations and loyalty, thus providing the court with another outlet to instruct the public on proper loyalty. In the case of weddings, these elite congratulations

---

<sup>87</sup> Stephen Bardle, *The Literary Underground in the 1660s: Andrew Marvel, George Wither, Ralph Wallis, and the World of Restoration Satire and Pamphleteering* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2012), 91.

<sup>88</sup> *London Evening Post*, March 14-16, 1733/4.

<sup>89</sup> David Cressey, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989), 188-89.

also allowed the court to display, especially those in the political spheres, proper emotional comportment.

The publication of congratulations and expressions of emotion declared by the representatives of cities, towns, counties and corporations created a new form of participation. As in the case of loyal grief for the death of a monarch and declarations of love and loyalty at their accessions, the Hanoverians took to the pages of the *Gazette* to display their affective exchanges with their subjects when a member of the royal family was wed. These addresses praised the suitability of the royal couples, and thanked the king for his part in the matches. Addressors used this as another opportunity to praise the king and his affection for his subjects.

The City of Bristol declared the marriage of George's eldest daughter, Princess Anne to William Prince of Orange in 1733/4 "a shining Instance of [the king's] royal Regard for the Welfare of [his] Subjects." The marriage strengthened Protestant alliances and provided even more assurance of Protestant heirs to the throne. It was therefore further evidence of the "Care for the Good of [his] People," which the representatives of Bristol had "constantly experienced." They expressed their own "Share of the public Joy," which equaled their "Interest in the public Advantage."<sup>90</sup> In 1740, the representatives of London told the king that marrying his daughter to the German prince was evidence of George's "steady Attention to the Honour and Interest of [his] Crown....and [his] Care and Regard for the Protestant Cause."<sup>91</sup>

The County of Norwich declared the Prince of Wales' marriage in 1736 to be evidence of the king's concern for the future of his people. He was thus, "like an indulgent Father of [his]

---

<sup>90</sup> *LG*, March 19-23, 1733/4.

<sup>91</sup> *LG*, May 10-13, 1740.

People."<sup>92</sup> The University of Oxford told the king in 1734 that, "whilst we feel the present Benefits of your Majestie's paternal Care and Affection for us," the king extended these benefits beyond his own reign by supporting his daughter's marriage. The University's representatives added that as the king was blessed "with the Duty and Affection of [his] own Children, so it is our hearty Wish, that you may always meet with the same filial Regard from all of your Subjects."<sup>93</sup> This served as both a declaration of loyalty and a reminder to readers of the way they ought to feel towards their king. Addresses thus promoted these marriages as the king's achievements and counseled loyal subjects on proper emotional comportment.

Even when they sought to praise the new couple, addressors still managed to give the king credit for his role in bringing about the match. The assembled representatives of Rochester deftly praised Princess Anne's husband and his connection to William III, to whom they owed "the Felicities of [George's] Reign." They declared their luck in being subjects of a king who "delights to be called the Father of [his] Country."<sup>94</sup> Similarly, the representatives of Nottingham's address to the king in 1733/4 evoked the marriage of William III and Mary II in 1677 and the joy it brought to the country. They declared that George's decision to marry his eldest daughter to the Prince of Orange was proof of the king's "unfeigned Concern for the lasting Happiness" of his subjects.<sup>95</sup> The marriages of George II's children elicited declarations of the king's great care for his subjects. The matches were not only beneficial to the royal family, but to the public interest as well.

---

<sup>92</sup> *LG*, May 11-15, 1736.

<sup>93</sup> *LG*, March 26-30, 1734.

<sup>94</sup> *LG*, March 30-April 4, 1734.

<sup>95</sup> *LG*, March 26-30, 1734.

Royal marriages were portrayed as a means to extend the power and influence of Britain throughout Europe and secure the Protestant dynasty for future generations. Most addresses made at least some mention of the children that, it was hoped, the union would produce. In 1740, London officials hoped the king's offspring would extend throughout the continent, spreading George and Caroline's "Illustrious Pattern" to the Protestant families of Europe.<sup>96</sup> Though Mary and Frederick had very little chance of ever coming to the British throne, one address congratulated the king on the match adding, "may there never be wanting one of your Royal Progeny to sit on the Throne."<sup>97</sup> Even the most distant claims to the throne were hailed as further insurance against dynastic upheaval.

Praising George's family and his fatherly care of the nation frequently elicited responses from the king, bearing promises of additional attention or protection. In 1733/4, George told the representatives of Oxford University that he took "very kindly" their expressions of "Affection to me and my Family."<sup>98</sup> In 1736, the Prince of Wales thanked the representatives of London for their "Affectionate Address" to himself and his bride, and promised them to look after the "Trade of the City."<sup>99</sup> Two weeks later, the Prince and Princess of Wales "accepted" the "reiterated Congratulations" from the ever-thorough Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of London. The Prince declared that he had "always had the sincerest Affection" for the city, but it was "greatly increas'd by the Marks of Attachment you shew to me on this Occasion."<sup>100</sup> George thanked

---

<sup>96</sup> *LG*, May 10-13, 1740.

<sup>97</sup> *LG*, May 20-24, 1740.

<sup>98</sup> *LG*, March 23-26, 1733/4.

<sup>99</sup> *LG*, April 27-May 1, 1736.

<sup>100</sup> *LG*, May 15-18, 1736.

London officials for their congratulations in 1740, and assured them, "You may always depend upon my Favour and Protection."<sup>101</sup> As discussed in chapter two, addressing was a way to gain royal notice and favor and ensure that the addressor's interests were not forgotten.

Royal responses were an important element in this exchange. They showed that addressing was not only a duty of loyal subjects, but also a sort of *quid pro quo*. Even when the responses of members of the royal family were not printed verbatim, it was noted that they answered "very graciously." The growing importance of the royal response is most evident in the reign of George III, when England saw its first sitting monarch marry in a century. In September 1761, the *Gazette* corrected its previous issue in which it failed to include the royal responses to the addresses of the University of Cambridge. After presenting their addresses to the king, his new wife, and his mother, Cambridge representatives had been received "very graciously" and "had all the Honour" to kiss the recipient's hand.<sup>102</sup> Whether this oversight had been pointed out by the University or the *Gazette*'s staff recognized the omission separately is purely a matter of speculation. However, the placement of these corrections on the first page directly above the addresses presented on behalf of Oxford University, Cambridge University's rival for royal notice, cannot have been a mistake.

The Hanoverian court promoted a very different form of celebrations for royal weddings than those favored by their predecessors. Both forms of celebrations provided the public with a means to communicate their devotion to the monarchy, but addressing was restricted to the elite, even though they ostensibly acted as representatives of the broader public. Rather than setting fires and shooting guns, the Hanoverians publicized the more controlled and refined form of

---

<sup>101</sup> *LG*, May 10-13, 1740.

<sup>102</sup> *LG*, Sept. 15-19, 1761.

loyalty displayed in addresses. This may have been an attempt to gain more favor from the political elite, upon whom royal power increasingly relied. But by publishing fewer accounts of bonfires and other similar celebrations, the court may have intended to deter its subjects from engaging in such behaviors. Traditional celebrations with bonfires and guns nevertheless continued, but focusing instead on addresses presented at court was likely an attempt to bring such celebrations into a controlled environment. Civic celebrations did sometimes go awry. Smith describes one such situation in Oxford in 1715, when a bonfire lit by soldiers to celebrate the king's birthday ended in a battle with Jacobite residents that also inspired the loyalist soldiers to break any unilluminated windows.<sup>103</sup> Reporting on addresses, rather than bonfires was another way in which the court sought to reform national manners. Using words to express loyalty, rather than fire and loud noises certainly seems a more refined means of communicating with a monarch. Royal marriages were another occasion on which the court reinforced the king's paternal love of the nation. Royal marriages were not expected to be affectionate, because they were part of the royal family's duty to their people. The court nevertheless used royal weddings to promote a culture of loyalty centered around mutual love.

### III. A Waning Institution?

The court used royal weddings to promote the image of the monarch as a paternal figure who showed his love of his people by arranging royal marriages that would ensure strength and stability for the nation. Royal weddings also provided clergymen and social reformers the opportunity to advocate marriage for the public as well. Marriage was a much-debated topic throughout the period. Wits and philosophers published polemics of varying levels of seriousness

---

<sup>103</sup> Smith, 186.



on the pros and cons of marriage, as well as a variety of advice books on finding the ideal mate. Such publications contributed to the anxieties that persisted through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which saw marriage as a waning institution.

The pitfalls of bestowing affection on the undeserving of the other sex were forewarned in numerous pamphlets and plays throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In 1673, a series of published "letters" debated the pros and cons of marriage. The first letter counseled the reader to avoid marrying for love, so as to not "lose thy selfe; [marry] to serve thy occasions, but to master thy passions, so to love with reason, as not to woe without sense." Marriage was in "no case more allowable than in the getting or preserving of an Estate."<sup>104</sup> His friend retorted that he must have been previously slighted by a lover or completely unfamiliar with the female sex, because "I never yet knew any despise Monarchy, but those who cannot be Monarchs."<sup>105</sup> This, like most publications on the subject, was presented as a diversion. Samuel Wright argued in 1733/4 that it was such "trifling and jesting humour that prevails in talking of this Subject, I believe, has often prov'd the reason of keeping it out of religious Discourses."<sup>106</sup>

Wright and other divines thought marriage was under attack, or at least unfashionable. They sought to rescue marriage's reputation in the public sphere by arguing for its necessity to society. A 1672 treatise on marriage used biblical precedents to argue that marriage "was good, as it was a model of the after Governments of the World: the Dominion of a Parent in his Family is a true representation of the Government of the Vertuous Prince, who is the Father of his

---

<sup>104</sup> Anon., *Essays of Love and Marriage being letters written by two gentlemen, one dissuading from love, the other an answer thereunto* (London, 1673), 11.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid, 17.

<sup>106</sup> Samuel Wright, *A Sermon on Marriage, preached at Black-Fryers, March 17, 1733/4* (London, 1733/4), 4.

Country."<sup>107</sup> Marriage was part of the fabric of society. At its core was a hierarchy in which the husband had dominion over a wife, as the government - at its head, the monarch - had dominion over the people. Royal marriage carried more weight because it forged alliances that would extend the nation's authority. In 1733/4, Wright asserted that, through the marriage of Princess Anne, "the interests of whole bodies and societies, and even of whole nations and kingdoms are hereby united, to the mutual strengthening of one another against common enemies, as well as the securing of a free and profitable commerce."<sup>108</sup> Marriage was necessary to a productive and successful nation. Royal marriages were especially essential, because they created alliances that would benefit the nation by building both commercial and military alliances.

In 1736, the Presbyterian minister Benjamin Atkinson dedicated a sermon to the Prince of Wales and his new wife. He urged the couple to "promote Love, Virtue and Piety, which will be most successfully effected by your Example and Authority."<sup>109</sup> Taking the ever-popular text of Isaiah 49:23 (*Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nursing mothers*), the exegete explained the text was a "metaphorical Expression, and signifieth the most tender Care, and parental Affection, which Parents commonly have for their Offspring."<sup>110</sup> Atkinson was especially keen to impress upon the royal couple the importance of their example and, upon his congregation, the importance of following it. He praised William III and Mary II for encouraging "the setting up Societies for the Reformation of Manners, which have met with Countenance and

---

<sup>107</sup> Anon., *An Account of Marriage, or, The Interests of marriage considered and defended against the unjust attacks of this age* (London, 1672), 17, 18-20, 22.

<sup>108</sup> Wright, 13.

<sup>109</sup> Benjamin Atkinson, *Good Princes Nursing Fathers and Nursing Mothers to the Church: A Sermon Preach'd in London, May 2, 1736, on the Marriage of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, with her Serene Highness the Princess of Sax-Gotha* (London, 1736), v. I have found no direct connection between Atkinson and the court.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

Encouragement in succeeding Reigns ever since."<sup>111</sup> It was an especially important point for the Prince of Wales, because "The Example of a Parent, or a Master, or a Magistrate, goes far, how much more the Example and Influence of a pious King or Queen?"<sup>112</sup> He thus charged the newlyweds with bringing religion "into Vogue and Fashion."<sup>113</sup> Atkinson warned that they did not deserve to be called nursing mothers and fathers, unless they encouraged "Justice, Temperance, Chastity and Benevolence every where, and among all Ranks and Degrees, from the highest to the lowest..by their Example and Authority."<sup>114</sup> Clearly, Atkinson thought the royal couple had far-reaching influence.

Royal couples were frequently promoted as models of proper, pious marriages. Simultaneously, Wright, Atkinson and their ilk impressed upon the royal family the need to rule with "tender Care, and parental Affection." Expecting royal couples to model the ideal marriage was perhaps a tall order, especially when the realities of royal marriages were somewhat out of step with social expectations of marriage. While royal couples were denied the luxury of marrying for love, advice columns and sermons urged their subjects to do just that.

#### IV. Love and Marriage in Early Modern England

Historians have frequently seen the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as the period in which love came to be seen as an essential component of marriage. Lawrence Stone's foundational work argued in 1977 that after 1660, ideals shifted and "companionate marriage"

---

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 17.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 16.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 13.

became increasingly the norm. Stone sees this as part of the "rise of the individual," which resulted from growing interest in and attention to individual feelings. Anne Laurence says after 1689, "the notion of companionship in marriage seems to have become more widespread."<sup>115</sup> Meanwhile, George Monger asserts that "the concept of companionate marriage was completely alien to the aristocracy of the eighteenth century."<sup>116</sup> Various parts of these arguments have been debated, but no one has explored the role the monarchy played in these changes. Royal marriages were not themselves companionate, at least at their outset. Royalty did not marry for love, even if they were lucky enough to fall in love with their spouses later. This seems to have been widely acknowledged. However, they were held up as models of ideal unions, and, as love was widely-held as the foundation for marriage, royal matches were occasionally described as affectionate.

Love was at the core of the rite itself. As discussed above, marriage was primarily a religious rite. Though this was not enforced until 1753, notions of the proper relationship between husband and wife were deeply steeped in religious tenets throughout the period. Yet, unlike the other royal celebrations in this study, very few sermons were published to commemorate royal weddings. This is likely because sermons were not generally part of the wedding itself. The ceremony came from a three to five page section in the Book of Common Prayer - depending on the edition and size of the print. The core of the Anglican marriage ceremony was the vows taken by both parties at the beginning of the rite.

Groom:

*to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death do us part.*

---

<sup>115</sup> Anne Laurence, *Women in England, 1500-1760: A Social History* (London: Phoenix Press, 1994), 41.

<sup>116</sup> George Monger, *Marriage Customs of the World: An Encyclopedia of Dating Customs and Wedding Traditions*, Vol I (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2013), 168.

Bride:

*to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love, cherish and to obey, till death do us part.*<sup>117</sup>

These vows remained the same even after the Book of Common Prayer was reassessed in 1661.<sup>118</sup>

This notion predates the Restoration. A collection of wedding sermons, "most of them pretty scarce," and dating from the first half of the seventeenth century, was published in two volumes in 1732 and 1736. The first volume specified that they were so collected to "lessen the Price to the Publick."<sup>119</sup> These volumes contained advice on how to live happily in marriage. They advised both partners to love one another. Matthew Mead's (d. 1699) sermon in this collection set the love of one's spouse above that of parents or children.<sup>120</sup> Most of these sermons had not been published prior to this collection, so they must have held some fascination for audiences in the 1730s, which suggests some level of consistency in views of marriage for some portion of society.

Richard Allestree's *Whole Duty of Man* was a best-seller throughout the period, and was published in numerous editions in the century following its initial publication in 1658. Allestree's work promoted love in marriage, but cautiously. Though the matrimonial ceremony in the Book of Common Prayer indicated three purposes for the creation of marriage - procreation, prevention of fornication, and mutual comfort - Allestree cited only the first two. He warned

---

<sup>117</sup> The Church of England, *The Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1717), 99.

<sup>118</sup> Christopher Haigh, "Liturgy and Liberty: The Controversy over the Book of Common Prayer, 1660-1663," *Journal of Anglican Studies* (May 2013): 32-64.

<sup>119</sup> *Conjugal duty: Part I set forth in a collection of ingenious and delightful wedding sermons* (London, 1732), ff. 2r.

<sup>120</sup> *Conjugal duty: Part II set forth in a collection of ingenious and delightful wedding sermons* (London, 1736), 125.

against the notion that marriage gave one license to fornicate freely. On the contrary, the purpose of marriage was "the subduing of lust, the keeping men from any sinful effects of it is very contrary to that end to make marriage an occasion of hightening and enflaming it."<sup>121</sup> Allestree's work exhibits the caution with which many seventeenth century clergymen treated emotions. Even in marriage, love could be dangerous and lead to sin.

In 1741, an updated version was published with the king's authorization and the telling subtitle, *For the Practice of the Present Age, as the Old Whole Duty of Man was design'd for those Unhappy Times in which it was written*. Quoting a letter from the Bishop of London, the preface clarified that when Allestree wrote his original treatise during Cromwell's rule many clergymen sought to convince their flocks that "*faith* was all, and *works* nothing."<sup>122</sup> The *New Whole Duty* laid greater emphasis on the way that husband and wife were to treat one another, because "happiness must begin at home."<sup>123</sup> Love was "a tender plant" that needed to be protected and, "in general," it warned, "we ought to be very tender as to what may affect another."<sup>124</sup>

Although some clergymen cautioned against giving into love of one's spouse,<sup>125</sup> it was generally accepted that a loving marriage was ideal. The lay writer Richard Steele urged love as the duty of both husband and wife, and "Not a sensual, or doting Passion, but genuine, conjugal

---

<sup>121</sup> Richard Allestree, *The Whole duty of man laid down in a plain and familiar way for the use of all, but especially the meanest reader* (London, 1713), 161.

<sup>122</sup> *The New whole duty of man, containing the faith as well as practice of a Christian; made easy for the practice of the present age, As the Old Whole Duty of Man was design'd for those unhappy Times in which it was written* 11e (London 1741). According to the English Short Title Catalogue, this version was published 26 times between 1741 and 1798.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid*, 220.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>125</sup> See chapter 2.

and constant, out of a *pure Heart fervently*, not grounded on *Beauty, Wealth or Interest*; for these may soon wither and fail."<sup>126</sup> Such "true hearted" love would prevent infidelity and quell disagreements within the home. It was the source of contentment and comfort for both partners.<sup>127</sup> In 1740, Philogamus warned that "To wed without Love, is to be ty'd by the Loins like a *Monkey* to a *Bed-Post*," and that "No Man ought to pay his Addresses where he cannot freely bestow his Heart." To marry without love turned "Courtship to *Flattery*, and Marriage to a *Bargain*."<sup>128</sup>

Despite the fact that royal marriages were, in fact, *bargains*, love and marriage were so intimately connected in the broader culture that poets and divines sometimes evoked love in their commemorations of royal marriages. In 1661, Charles' "Royal heart" was guided to "so happy a choice," as Catherine; and in 1683, Prince George traversed the sea "To meet his Royal Love."<sup>129</sup> In 1677, the poet John Oldham praised William for loving within reason:

Others move only by unbridled guideless Heat,  
But you mix Love with Policy, Passion with State.<sup>130</sup>

However, as discussed above, the court did not promote royal marriages as loving unions, but as evidence of the king's love of his people.

---

<sup>126</sup> Richard Steele, *What are the duties of man and wife towards each other* (London, 1711), 4. Italics in original. Here, Steele references 1 Peter 1:22 (*Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently*). This passage does not refer specifically to conjugal love.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 5. According to Stone, Steele was himself in a companionate marriage and devoted to his wife: Stone, 235.

<sup>128</sup> Philogamus, *Marriage Defended or the Ladies Protected* (London, 1741), 41. Italics in original.

<sup>129</sup> TNA, SP 63/307/1, ff. 133 r. Published in *Kingdomes Intelligencer*, June 10-17, 1661; John Tatham, *Aqua triumphalis, being a true relation of the honourable the city of Londons entertaining Their Sacred Majesties upon the river of Thames* (London, 1662), 2; Anon., *Upon the marriage of Prince George* (1683), 1.

<sup>130</sup> Oldham, 2.

In the 1730s and 1740s, Hanoverian unions were occasionally praised as ideal, loving unions. One author, declaring himself only as a "Gentleman of the University of Oxford," wrote an opera inspired by Princess Anne's wedding in 1733/4, declaring:

The virtuous Joys that *Marriage* gives are a fit Theme for the Sons of *Parnassus*, where only a *Private Occasion* offers, but to view the *illustrious Personages* before us, setting examples of *connubial Love*, must inspire the meanest Bard to tune his Strings, and warble forth an *Epithalium*, though in the most awkward Strains.<sup>131</sup>

Social and cultural ideas of marriage widely held that love was necessary to a proper union. The royal couple thus set the example of a loving marriage, even though in reality, they barely knew each other. Regardless of reality, royal marriages were hailed as a remedy to improper or impious unions, because they were models of behavior and comportment. As Stephen Duck declared in his 1734, when such virtues (as Princess Anne's) "adorn the Great, We see, we hear, admire and imitate."<sup>132</sup>

## VI. Gendered Ideals

Marrying for love was ideal, but did not guarantee future contentment at home. A great deal of ink was spilled throughout the period in giving advice to married couples on how to create and maintain a happy marriage. Much of this advice centered on gender roles, which formed the foundation of happy marriages. Love was essential to a happy marriage, but love implied different roles for men and women.

The Book of Common Prayer dictated different vows for men and women. Brides vowed *to obey*, while this was noticeably absent from the groom's vows. Bishop Jeremy Taylor (d. 1667) observed that "there is nothing said in the husband's vow about "rule", for this is included

---

<sup>131</sup> Anon., *The royal marriage, a ballad opera of three acts...Occasion'd by the ever-memorable Nuptials of their Royal Highnesses the Prince of Wales and the Princess of Sax-Gotha* (London, 1736), ff 1r-v.

<sup>132</sup> Duck (1734), 4.



in the word love."<sup>133</sup> In other words, part of the husband's duty to his wife was to govern her; this was a form of love, according to Taylor. Male love was thus different from female love. Men loved through governing their wives, while wives loved through obedience.

The Anglican vows laid the foundations for the marital relationship and thus illustrate societal expectations. Subordination of women lay at the heart of Anglican marriage, which might not seem consistent with the vow *to love* in modern minds. It is likely that the very modern notion that a companionate marriage requires equality of the partners influenced Stone's assertion that as marriages became more companionate, they became less patriarchal.<sup>134</sup> Specifically, Stone claims that the "increasing stress laid by the early seventeenth-century preachers on the need for companionship in marriage in the long run tended to undercut their own arguments in favour of the maintenance of strict wifely subjection and obedience."<sup>135</sup> However, here, Stone projects modern assumptions onto the past. This cognitive dissonance simply did not exist in the early modern period. Early modern divines, poets and politicians had no problem with the notion of loving and unequal marriages.

Throughout the period, couples were counseled to love one another. However, it was largely the wife's duty to earn and maintain her husband's love. In 1661, William Secker argued that "Man is an affectionate Creature, now the Womans behaviour should be so towards the man, as to requite his affection by increasing his delectation...[she] should carry her self so to her husband as not to disturb his love by her contention."<sup>136</sup> Wives were responsible for maintaining

---

<sup>133</sup> Quoted in: Augustus Theodore Wirgman, *The Prayer Book: with Scripture Proofs and Historical Notes* (London: Bemrose & Sons, 1873), 194.

<sup>134</sup> Stone, Ch. 8, esp. 217-225.

<sup>135</sup> Stone, 217.

<sup>136</sup> William Secker, *A wedding-ring fit for the finger* (London, 1661), 19.

affection in their marriage. Essentially, because men were "affectionate Creature(s)," if a man did not love his wife, it must be the result of her "contention."

According to Allestree, it was the wife's duty to love her husband, "and together with that, all Friendliness and Kindness of Conversation."<sup>137</sup> Meanwhile, a husband's first duty was to love his wife and to "be very tender and compassionate" to her.<sup>138</sup> While love was the husband's first duty, Allestree urged wives to first devote their energies to obedience and fidelity. The "happier" version of Allestree's *Whole Duty of Man* published in 1741 did not elevate women above the subordinate position originally laid out by Allestree. Men were responsible for trade and national peace, and were thus "superior" to women; yet, they were not to rule women with "tyrannical authority."<sup>139</sup>

For women, accepting a subordinate position was a feminine virtue - one for which royal brides provided ideal models. Addresses presented to royal brides praised them for their ability to earn their grooms' affections. According to Charles Beem, Mary intentionally appeared submissive to William in public.<sup>140</sup> Princess Anne's virtue and charm would "create...the most affectionate Tenderness and Love" in her husband, according to the officials of London. Meanwhile, they wished the Prince of Orange "Joy and Delight" from the princess' "Endearments and Affection."<sup>141</sup> In a poem written to commemorate his marriage, the Prince of

---

<sup>137</sup> Allestree (1713), 301.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid, 303.

<sup>139</sup> *The New whole duty of man*, 221.

<sup>140</sup> Charles Beem, "Why Prince George of Denmark did not become King of England," in *The Man Behind the Queen: Male Consorts in History*, eds. Charles Beem and Miles Taylor (New York, NY: Palgrave, 2014), 87.

<sup>141</sup> *LG*, March 16-19, 1733/4.

Orange was also congratulated for winning a bride "In whom superior Sense, with Judgment joins, Her Beauty much, but more her Merit shines."<sup>142</sup> The princess thus exhibited the feminine virtues that would induce her husband to love her. This laid the foundation of the couple's future happiness.

Women were responsible for maintaining their husbands' happiness, as well as to produce and raise children. The pressure to produce surviving children was undoubtedly increased for the female members of a royal dynasty who had gained the throne by the failure of the previous dynasty to produce viable heirs. Addressors rarely failed to mention this duty to female members of the royal family in the 1730s and 1740s, and especially hailed Queen Caroline as an example motherhood. While her husband was praised for his paternal care for the people in making matched for his children that would insure the Protestant line in Britain and on the continent, Queen Caroline was praised for producing such progeny to make the match possible. The queen was also given credit for raising her children to be examples of virtue that would make them marriageable. At her eldest son's marriage in 1736, the queen was praised for being the model of "Private Life," while her husband exhibited the model of public life.<sup>143</sup> The role of a female member of the royal family was thus clear: the bearing and raising of children. In 1734, the Mayor and other London officials said that the queen deserved gratitude for raising such a daughter that would bring the Prince of Orange "Happiness" and support the interests of Britain.<sup>144</sup> They praised her support of the Prince of Wales' marriage as evidence of her attention

---

<sup>142</sup> Stephen Duck, *A poem on the marriage of His serene Highness, the Prince of Orange, with Ann, Princess-Royal of Great-Britain* (London, 1734), 4.

<sup>143</sup> *LG*, April 27-May 1, 1736.

<sup>144</sup> *LG*, March, 16-19, 1733/4.

to her son's happiness in 1736, and hoped that the queen's "glorious Instance" of marriage would inspire similar virtue in her new daughter-in-law.<sup>145</sup>

This role was passed on to the new bride, whose role it was to maintain and perpetuate royal authority through her children. Nearly every address included some allusion to the future progeny of the new couple - especially those presented to the new bride. Procreation was a woman's duty and it would seem the happiness of the union was only a concern for politicians to the extent it fostered procreation. Any affection that might result in the union was presented as yet another means through which the bride would conceive. In 1733/4, London representatives of London begged Princess Anne to fulfill their "ardent Desires" by filling the world with "numerous Progeny."<sup>146</sup> In 1736, London's address referred to the Prince of Wales's future offspring as "endearing Pledges of [the couple's] mutual Love."<sup>147</sup> The representatives of the University of Oxford wished George III and Charlotte to "set forth the brightest Pattern, and also reap the blessed Fruits and Effects of Conjugal Affection."<sup>148</sup>

Published addresses presented royal women as models of feminine virtue. They were reasonable and obedient; but most importantly, they comported themselves in ways that would inspire the love of their husbands. This would in turn (it was supposed) lead to procreation. These images of royal female virtue should thus be seen as another means through which the court sought to influence their subjects' behaviors.

---

<sup>145</sup> *LG*, April 27-May 1, 1736.

<sup>146</sup> *LG*, March 16-19, 1733/4.

<sup>147</sup> *LG*, April 27 - May 1, 1736.

<sup>148</sup> *LG*, Sept. 15-19, 1761.

## VII. Conclusion

Royal marriages have always been a matter of public interest. In the last half of the seventeenth century, they were celebrated with through the traditional means of fire and loud noises. Though the court was especially careful to promote popular royal marriages, particularly William and Mary's in 1677, the weddings themselves were private affairs. The public was not led to expect knowledge of these unions. Privacy allowed less popular matches to be solidified without scandal - or with delayed scandal, as in the case of James II's marriage in 1673. James' marriage created great anxiety among his staunchly Protestant subjects, and eventually contributed to his abdication in the Revolution of 1688. It was perhaps for this reason that the Hanoverians chose to make their weddings open to the public. Laying open the marriage ceremony itself to the public would make it difficult for the validity of these unions, and thus the right of any resulting offspring, to be called into question later. As the late Stuarts illustrated, the line of succession could be unpredictable in a period when death and infertility abounded. By publishing the details of the wedding of even his younger daughter, Mary, George II ensured that any grandchildren to whom the crown might fall would be legitimate. The decision to make royal weddings more public events may have also been driven by the increased expectation of access to the personal lives of the royal family that Steven Catania has recently illustrated in his study of reportage on royal health in the period.<sup>149</sup>

Royal weddings provided yet another opportunity for the royal family to set the example of proper emotional comportment, though it was not until the Hanoverian marriages in the 1730s that the court took full advantage of this. As we saw in the last chapter, love was presented as the key to national unity. In a period of widening partisan divisions, sermons and other publications

---

<sup>149</sup> Steven Catania, "Brandy Nan and Farmer George: Public Perceptions of Royal Health and the Demystification of Monarchy During the Long Eighteenth Century," (Ph.D. diss., Loyola University Chicago, 2014).

celebrating the transition of power from one reign to the next touted love of neighbor and monarch as the key to peace. Starting in the 1730s, the Hanoverian court used royal weddings as an opportunity to remind their subjects of the importance of exhibiting loyalty through expressions of affection. Love within marriage was indeed an ideal throughout the period. However, this was not expected of royal marriages. In fact, even when presented as models of marital bliss, royal couples were not frequently portrayed as being in love. Instead, they were praised for their virtue and concern for the public welfare. Their subjects expressed love for the royal family and especially the king, for their service to the nation.

Royal brides were lauded for fulfilling their feminine duties. Women were expected to be obedient, as the Anglican marriage vows made clear, but they were also to exhibit virtue, reason and even affection (which would lead to procreation), that would earn their husbands' love. Princesses Anne and Mary were praised in addresses for being the type of women that would gain the affections of their illustrious husbands. Affection led to children, which was one of the main purposes of marriage. Meanwhile, their husbands were praised for their Protestantism and the benefits they would bring to England - mostly of a military nature.

Religious and secular publications held all royal couples up as the models of marriage in an effort to promote matrimony. Marriage itself was a way to please God and fulfill one's duty to society by becoming a productive unit in the ever-growing social fabric. Marriage was a keystone of society and promoting it not only endeared the monarchy to their subjects, but also fostered national unity. Unfortunately for the women who ostensibly held more power than anyone else of their sex, Stone's assertion that expectations of companionate marriages led to increased equality between husband and wife simply did not apply to them. Royal brides did not marry for love, nor were they expected to be an equal member of the union. Instead, royal wives

were presented as examples of proper obedient femininity. They were praised for their progeny and their virtue, not for loving their husbands.

In light of the evidence above, it seems that the Hanoverians were simply more savvy than the late Stuarts - particularly Charles II, as he was king when the last Stuart weddings took place. The Hanoverians knew the importance of securing public opinion in their favor. They undoubtedly learned from the failures of Charles and his family. James II's secret marriage essentially laid the groundwork for the end of their dynasty. Public nuptials certainly worked in favor of the dynasty, in light of this history. However, it is also very possible that the Hanoverian court appealed to increasing demands for transparency. After the events of the late seventeenth century, which were still very much a part of national consciousness, it is natural that subjects of all classes would expect to be made aware of choices made by the royal family that affected the public. This thus serves as another example of the court *both* leading and following. The crown relied on public opinion in many ways, but people still looked to the monarch and the whole royal family as exemplars of ideal behavior. Likewise, the royal family actively promoted itself as exemplary as this also increased its power. Monarchs thus walked a fine line between being what others expected them to be and creating a culture that would best suit their interests. In their eighteenth century, they could no longer remain hidden behind the walls of the court. They had to become more accessible, they had to become public figures, interacting and leading their people.





Fig. 2 William Kent, "The Wedding of Princess Anne and William of Orange in the Chapel of St James's as decorated by William Kent, on 14 March 1734," etching, 1734, British Museum, London.



## CHAPTER SIX

### CONCLUSION

Charles II was known as a master of his own emotions. He controlled his courtiers not only through gifts and favors, but through his behavior in one-on-one interactions. His brother James II was less charismatic, but made little effort to counter this failing. After James abandoned his throne, the monarchy became more reliant on public opinion - or at least more aware of this reliance. In 1688/9, William and Mary ceded some of the crown's power to Parliament, which fundamentally changed the character of royal authority. Though Charles and James had fought their own battles with public opinion (to varying degrees of success), after 1688/9, the monarch no longer had the option to make laws without heeding the will of institutions that represented the will of the people - by definition, if not always in fact. After 1688/9, the monarchy increasingly reached out to the public to exercise its political and cultural influence. Ruling with diminished authority required the early eighteenth-century monarchy to create a new relationship with its subjects, by both appealing to cultural trends and using them to the royal advantage.

Emotions were at the heart of the fight for the pious high ground in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Late seventeenth-century debates over the individual's capacity for piety through self-governance pitted nonconformists, or latitudinarians who saw reason as the key to piety against High Church Anglicans who expressed skepticism over man's ability to overcome his inherent sinfulness. High Church Anglicans tended towards a negative view of emotions, warning their flocks that emotions equaled attachment to temporal existence and

detracted from reverence of the divine. Latitudinarians countered this by arguing that human reason could govern one's emotions. When properly governed, emotions served to motivate the individual to feel and act piously. William and Mary's accession aided in the latitudinarian ascendancy. They and their successors also supported the Societies for the Reformation of Manners which often promoted the pursuit of piety through individual reason. In the eighteenth century, the court increasingly promoted emotions as the key to proper self-governance and national unity. Propaganda used to publicize these ideas was most potent when the eyes of the nation turned towards the court.

Ceremonies were the most direct point of contact between the sovereign and his or her subjects in the seventeenth century. Ceremony offered the crown a powerful means through which to communicate and influence the public, but the form of royal ceremonies changed to suit the demands of circumstance. Funerals had once been grand occasions, but the later Stuarts opted for private affairs, both for financial and cultural reasons. The one exception to this was Queen Mary II's funeral in 1695, when a grand (and expensive) rite was created to unite the people in grief and in support of their widowed king. The funerals held for Mary's successors were designed as more intimate affairs, increasingly obscured from public view. The royal body was no longer presented as a divine object of veneration; rather, private royal funerals celebrated the monarch's humanity.

The form of coronations remained largely static throughout the period to maintain the appearance of continuity. However, commemorations focused on the coronation oath, which solidified the mutually-dependent relationship between sovereign and subject. Meanwhile, the Hanoverians decided to make royal family weddings more open, if not entirely "public" affairs. Royal marriages celebrated and ensured dynastic continuity, and reminded the public of the

family's service to the nation. Simultaneously, the court shifted focus from the traditional public celebrations of bonfires and bell ringing to the elite, mannered addresses presented by public representatives. This shift consolidated focus on the elite and provided models of behavior to the wider public.

A major component of elite behavior was proper affective comportment. Printed addresses displayed both by the monarch and members of the political elite, who demonstrated the levels of grief or jubilation appropriate to specific occasions. William III was praised for controlling his grief over his wife's death, and two decades later, Anne was praised for properly grieving the losses experienced during her life as a *woman of sorrowful spirit*. Proper grief was not a specifically female attribute. As queen regnant, Anne was not a typical woman. Clergymen promoted her as a model of piety for the entire nation. In 1727, George II overtly grieved the death of his father and was presented as a model of a properly-grieving son in advice columns and sermons. At the same time, congratulations were expressed in increasingly emotive ways as monarchs declared their love for their country, encouraging their subjects to express their loyalty through expressions of love for their king.

Monarchs exhibited their support of the nation in ever-more emotive terms and clergymen urged their flocks to unite with their fellow subjects in loving their sovereign. Just as the Cambridge Platonists and their proponents urged the pursuit of peace through love, the court sought to heal political and social divisions by creating a culture that celebrated the monarchy as an institution and monarchs as individuals. Successive courts thus took inspiration from unifying strategies expounded from the pulpit.

While Charles II had employed emotions to control his inner circle, later Stuart and early Hanoverian rulers sought to expand the scope of their control by creating emotional bonds with

their subjects, even those who did not come to court. To do this, they had to navigate changing emotional ideals. One wonders what the ramifications might have been for William had he expressed his grief for his wife's death as overtly as George II did for his father. At the same time, by promoting themselves and their courtiers as models of behavior in print, monarchs extended the boundary of their influence. Printed addresses displayed the ways that the elite expressed their love and support of the monarch, successfully receiving promises of favor. Likewise, royal affect provided a guide to the political elite, who echoed the words and phrases used in royal speeches. These exchanges, combined with loyalist counsel from the pulpit created emotional dialogues between the crown and the people.

It was during the early eighteenth century that the court began to create the modern cult of monarchy that would become so heavily ingrained under George III. Monarchs expressed their love of their people in parental terms, eliciting love in return. They also promoted affective display as proper expressions of loyalty to crown and country. In the face of growing competition for the public's attention, British monarchs used emotions to win hearts and minds.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Archival Sources

#### British Library, London, U.K.

Add MS Ch 76089: 1706

Add MS Ch 76101: 1708

Add MS 6282, "Claims at the Coronation of King George I"

Add MS 61421: 1704-Late 1730s (Vol. CCCXXI, ff. 166)

Add MS 59741: 1605 (includes portion of *The Fate of British Majesty*, 1714)

Add MS 61700 C: [1707?] (Blenheim Papers Vol. DCC, ff. 20)

Add MS 61118: 1701-1710 (Blenheim Papers Vol. XVIII, ff. 232)

Add MS 61355: 1708-1724

Add MS 78478: 1706-1732 (Evelyn Papers)

Egerton MS 3773: 1703-1704

Lansdowne MS

Stowe MS (Hanoverian Papers)

#### College of Arms, London, U.K.

I 4

L 17-19

M 3bis

Miscellaneous Vol. I

Royal Ceremonies 23

SML 61-66

Lambeth Palace, London, U.K.

Compton Papers (FP Compton 1 and 2)

Secker Papers (MS 1130/1-2)

Wake Papers (MS 1770)

The National Archive, Kew, U.K.

Office of Works (WORK)

Records of the Lord Chamberlain (LC)

Records of the Privy Council (PC)

State Papers Domestic (SP)

## **Newspapers**

*British Apollo*

*British Mercury*

*Caledonian Mercury*

*Daily Courant*

*Evening Post*

*Flying Post or the Post Master*

*Gazette (Paris)*

*London Courant*

*London Gazette*

*Mercure Gallant*

*Nouvelles des Cours de L'Europe*

*Observer*

*Plain Dealer*

*Post Boy*

*Post Man and the Historical Account*

### **Printed Primary Sources**

Allestree, Richard. *The Whole duty of man laid down in a plain and familiar way for the use of all, but especially the meanest reader*. London, 1713.

Anne, Queen of England. *Queen Anne's reasons for her conduct, both with respect to the war and peace*. London, 1715.

Anon. *Harangue de sa Majeste la Reine de Grande Bretagne*. The Hague, 1712.

Anon. *Human Passions: a satyr. To which is added, an ode to impudence*. London, 1726.

Anon. *The queen's famous progress, or; Her Majesty's royal journey to the Bath, and happy return*. London, 1702.

Anon., *The royal marriage, a ballad opera of three acts...Occasion'd by the ever-memorable Nuptials of their Royal Highnesses the Prince of Wales and the Princess of Sax-Gotha*. London, 1736.

Atkinson, Benjamin. *Good Princes Nursing Fathers and Nursing Mothers to the Church: A Sermon Preach'd in London, May 2, 1736, on the Marriage of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, with her Serene Highness the Princess of Sax-Gotha*. London, 1736.

Ayloff, William. *The government of the passions, according to the rules of reason and religion*. London, 1704.

Boyer, Abel. *The history of the reign of Queen Anne, digested into annals. Year the first*. London, 1703.

Bragge, Francis. *A practical treatise for the regulation of the passions*. London, 1708.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Prayers and meditations upon several uncommon subjects and occasions. Fitted for the use of particular persons and private families*. London, 1715.

Burnet, Elizabeth. *A method of devotion: or, rules for holy & devout living, with prayers on several occasions, and advices & devotions for the Holy Sacrament.* London, 1708.

*By the Queen, a proclamation, declaring Her Majesties pleasure touching Her Royal coronation and the solemnity thereof.* London, 1702.

Centlivre, Susanna. *A Poem Humbly Presented to his Most Sacred Majesty George, King of Gt. Britain, France, and Holland upon his Accession to the Throne.* London, 1715.

*A Ceremonial for the Reception of his Most Sacred Majesty George by Grace of God, King of Great Britain upon his Arrival from Holland to his Kingdom of Gt. Britain.* Savoy, 1714.

*The Church of England's joy on the happy accession of Her Most Sacred Majesty Anne, to the throne. Published on the glorious day of her coronation.* London, 1702.

*A complete account of the ceremonies observed in the coronations of the kings and queens of England.* London, 1727.

Defoe, Daniel. *The family instructor.* London, 1718.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jure divino: a satyr, in twelve books.* London.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The mock mourners. A satyr, by way of elegy on King William.* London, 1702.

Dorrington, Theophilus. *Reform'd devotions, in meditations, hymns, and petitions, for every day in the week.* London, 1708.

Ecclestone, Thomas. *The way to happiness.* London, 1726.

Edzard, J.E. *God save the Queen! The most hearty acclamation of the Lutherans in London, Expressed at the royal proclamation and coronation of Her most excellent Majestie..* London, 1702.

Epictetus. *Epictetus: a poem, containing the Maxims of that Celebrated Philosopher, for the Government of the Passions in the Conduct of Life.* London, 1709.

Fénelon, François de Salignac de La Mothe. *Fables and dialogues of the dead.* Second edition corrected. London, 1723.

*The Four Indian Kings Speech to her Majesty.* London, 1710.

Frowde, Philip. *Verses on Her Majesty's Birth-Day.* London, 1728.

*The grand exemplar, Set forth, in an impartial character Of His Sacred Majesty King George. With some remarkables of his life.* Dublin and London, 1715.



*Great Britain's Welcome to his Sacred Majesty King George: a Poem Occasion'd by his Successful and Glorious Negotiations this Summer.* London, 1719.

Harris, John. *A Sermon Preach'd in the Parish Church of Stroud near Rochester in Kent on August 1, 1715. Being the Day of Thanksgiving Appointed for King George's Happy Accession to the Crown.* London, 1715.

Harris, Joseph. *A Funeral Pindarique Ode Sacred to the Happy Memory of Our Late Gracious Sovereign Queen Anne with a Congratulatory Poem on our Present Most Illustrious King George.* London, 1714.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Great Britain's Glory: or, the Loyal Subject's Praise for his Sacred Majesty King George, and his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, heir Safe Arrival and Welcome into England.* London, 1714.

*Her Majestie's Welcome to St. Paul's cathedral. A poem.* 1702.

J., S. *City and country recreation: or, wit and merriment rightly calculated, for the pleasure and advantage of either sex.* London, 1705.

Jenks, Silvester. *An essay upon the art of love, containing an Exact Anatomy of Love and all other Passions which attend it.* London (?), 1702.

Luttrell, Narcissus. *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714* Vols. 1-6. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1857.

Mandeville, Bernard. *The fable of the bees: or, private vices, publick benefits.* London, 1714.

Masters, Thomas. *A sermon Preach'd in Rotherhithe on January 20 1714/1715 Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving for his Majesty's Peaceable and Happy Accession to the Throne of these Realms.* London, 1715.

Nicolson, William. *The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle, 1702 – 1718.* Eds. Elyve Jones and Geoffrey Holmes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Renoult, Jean-Baptiste. *Le panegyrique de leurs majestez Britanniques, Guillaume Le Grand troisieme du nom, ...et de la reine Anne...* London, 1702.

Reresby, Tamworth, trans. *New Dialogues of the Gods; or, reflections upon the passions.* London, 1713.

Ripa, Cesare. *Iconologia: or, Moral emblems...* London, 1709.

*The Whole ceremony of the coronation of his most sacred Majesty King George: On Wednesday the twentieth day of October, 1714.* Dublin, 1715.

Woodward, Josiah. *The Divine joy of religion. A sermon preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, and citizens of London at St. Lawrence...* London, 1701.

## Secondary Sources

Adams, Christine, Jack R. Senser and Lisa Jane Graham, eds. *Visions and Revisions of Eighteenth-Century France*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University press, 1997.

Adams, David and Adrian Armstrong, eds. *Print and Power in France and England, 1500-1800*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Andreadis, Harriette. "The Case of Queen Anne's Court." In *Sappho in Early Modern England: Female Same-Sex Literary Erotics*, Eadem. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Archer, Ian. "City and Court Connected : The Material Dimensions of Royal Ceremonial, ca. 1480–1625," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 71:1 (2008): 157-79

Arminjon, Catherine and Béatrix Saule, eds. *Tables royales et festins de cour en Europe 1661-1789 : actes du colloque international*, Palais des congrès, Versailles, 25-26 février 1994 (Rencontres de l'École du Louvre, 13) (Paris: École du Louvre, 2004).

Ashton, John. *Social Life in the Reign of Queen Anne*. Detroit, MI: Singing Tree Press, 1883, 1968.

Auchincloss, Louis. *False Dawn: Women in the Age of the Sun King*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1984.

Bak, János M., ed. *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Ritual*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.

Baker, Geoff and Ann McGruer, eds. *Readers, Audience and Coteries in Early Modern England*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2006.

Baldwin, Olive and Thelma Wilson, "England's Glory' and the Celebrations at Court for Queen Anne's Birthday in 1706," *Theatre Notebook* 62:1 (2008): 7-19.

Banks, Kenneth J. *Chasing Empire Across the Sea: Communications and the State in the French Atlantic, 1713 – 1763*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.

Barash, Carol. *English Women's Poetry, 1649-1714: Politics, Community, and Linguistic Authority*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Beem, Charles. *The Lioness Roared: The Problems of Female Rule in English History*. Basingstoke, 2006.

- Bell, Catherine. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Beresford, John. *Gossip of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. London: R. Cobden-Sanderson, 1923.
- Bergeron, David Moore. "Stuart Civic Pageants and Textual Performance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 163-83.
- Berry, Helen. *Gender, Society and Print Culture in Late-Stuart England: The Cultural World of the Athenian Mercury*. Ashgate, 2003.
- Bloch, Marc. *Les rois thaumaturges: étude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre*. Paris: Gallimard, 1983.
- Bond, R.P. *Queen Anne's American Kings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Bowers, Toni. "Queen Anne Makes Provision." In *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetics and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker. Berkeley, 1998.
- Bowie, Karin. "Public Opinion, Popular Politics and the Union of 1707," *Scottish Historical Review* 82:2:214 (2003): 226-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Publicity, Parties and Patronage: Parliamentary Management and the Ratification of the Anglo-Scottish Union," *Scottish Historical Review* 87: suppl. (2008): 78-93.
- Breen, Michael P. *Law, City and King: Legal Culture, Municipal Politics and State Formation in Early Modern Dijon*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2007.
- Brewer, John. *Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "This, That and the Other: Public, Social and Private in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." In *Shifting the Boundaries*, eds. Darios Castiglione and Lesley Sharpe. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1995.
- Bucholz, R.O. *The Augustan Court: Queen Anne and the Decline of Court Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Going to Court in 1700: A Visitor's Guide," *The Court Historian* V (December, 2000): 181 – 215.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Nothing but Ceremony': Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual," *Journal of British History* 30:3 (1991): 288-323.

- Cannandine, David, and Simon Price, eds. *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Champion, Larry S., ed. *Quick Springs of Sense: Studies in the Eighteenth Century*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1974.
- Chartier, Roger. "Leisure and Sociability: Reading Aloud in Early Modern Europe." In *Urban Life in the Renaissance*, eds. Susan Zimmerman and Ronald Weismann, 103-20. London: Associated University Presses, 1989.
- Calhoun, Craig ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992.
- Clark, C.E. *The Public Prints: The Newspaper in Anglo-American Culture*. New York, 1994.
- Clery, E. J. "Women, Publicity and the Coffee-House Myth," *Women: A Cultural Review* 2 (1991): 168-77.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Conroy, David. *In Public Houses: Drink and the Revolution of Authority in Colonial Massachusetts*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1995.
- Cook, Elizabeth Heckendorn. *Epistolary Bodies: Gender and Genre in the Eighteenth Century Republic of Letters*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Coombs, D. S. *The Conduct of the Dutch: British Opinion and the Dutch Alliance During the War of the Spanish Succession*. The Hague, 1958.
- Copeland, David. *Debating the Issues in Colonial Newspapers*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2000.
- Coutu, Joan Michèle. *Persuasion and Propaganda: Monuments and the Eighteenth-Century British Empire*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University, 2006.
- Cowan, Brian. "Geoffrey Holmes and the Public Sphere: Augustan Historiography from Post-Namierite to the Post-Habermasian," *Parliamentary History* 28:1 (2009): 166-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Publicity and Privacy in the History of the British Coffeehouse," *History Compass* 5:4 (2007): 1180-1213.
- Cressy, David. *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

- Crane, R.S. and F.B Kye. *A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals 1620-1800*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1927.
- Crawford, Katherine. *Perilous Performances: Gender and Regency in Early Modern France*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Croft, Pauline. "Libels, Popular Literacy and Public Opinion in Early Modern England," *Historical Research* 68 (1995): 266-85.
- Curran, Kevin. *Marriage, Performance, and Politics at the Jacobean Court*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009.
- Cust, Richard. "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England," *Past and Present* 112 (1986).
- Danesi, Marcel. *The Quest for Meaning: A Guide to Semiotic Theory and Practice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- Dean, Ann. *The Talk of the Town: Figurative Publics in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2007.
- Deploige, Jeroen and Gita Deneckere, eds. *Mystifying the Monarch: Studies on Discourse, Power and History*. Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
- Dickinson, H. T. *The Politics of the People in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Macmillan, 1994.
- Dooley, Brendan and Sabrina Baron, eds. *The Politics of Information in Early Modern Europe*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Downie, James. *Robert Harley and the Press: Propaganda and Public Opinion in the Age of Swift and Defoe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Public Opinion and the Political Pamphlet." In *The Cambridge History of English Literature, 1660-1780*, ed. John Richetti. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Periodicals and Politics in the Reign of Queen Anne." In *Serials and their Readers 1620-1914*, eds. Robin Myers and Michael Harris. Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliogs., 1993.
- Durkeim, Emile. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Trans. Joseph Ward Swain. London: Allen and Unwin, 1915;
- Edie, Carolyn A. "The Public Face of Royal Ritual: Sermons, Medals and Civic Ceremony in Later Stuart Coronations," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 53:4 (1990) 311-36.

- Ellison, Julie. *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Emson, H. E. "For Want of an Heir: The Obstetrical History of Queen Anne," *British Medical Journal*, 304 (May 23, 1992).
- Eustace, Nicole. *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power and the Coming of the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Feather, John. *History of British Publishing*. London: Croom Helm, 1988.
- Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Fissell, Mary E. *Vernacular Bodies: The Politics of Reproduction in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Ford, Worthington Chauncy. "The Conflict Between the Governor and Council of Massachusetts on the Death of Queen Anne." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 15 (1902): 327-62.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Fox, Adam. "Rumour, News and Popular Political Opinion in Elizabethan and Early Stuart London," *Historical Journal* 40 (1997): 597-620.
- Fradenberg, L., ed. *Women and Sovereignty*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1991.
- Freist, Dagmar. "The King's Crown is the Whore of Babylon: Politics, Gender and Communication in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England." *Gender & History* 7:3 (1995): 457-81.
- Fritz, Paul. "From 'Public' to 'Private' : The Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1830." In *Mirrors of Morality: Studies in the Social History of Death*, ed. J. Whaley (1981): 61-79.
- Frye, Susan. *Pens and Needles: Women's Textualities in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.
- Frye, Susan and Karen Robertson, eds. *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Gallagher, Megan. "Rule and Resistance: Theorizing the Female Sovereign in Sixteenth-Century Europe," *Comitatus* 39 (2008): 219-224.

- Geertz, Clifford. "Centers, Kings and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power." In Idem, *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. Basic Books, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- George, Charles. *The Stuarts: A Century of Experiment, 1603-1714*. Blond Educational, 1973.
- George, M.D. *English Political Caricature: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda*, Vol. I, 1640-1792. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Gibbs, G. C. "Press and Public Opinion: Prospective." In *Liberty Secured?: Britain Before and After 1688*, ed. James R. Jones. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Giesey, Ralph. "The King Imagined." In *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture* Vol. 1, ed. K.M. Baker. Oxford: Pergamon, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Modèles de Pouvoir dans les Rites Royaux en France," *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 41:3 (May-June 1986): 579-99.
- Glucksman, Max, ed. *Essays on the Ritual of Social Relations*. Manchester, 1962.
- Gregg, Edward. "The Education of Princes: Queen Anne and her Contemporaries." In *Education in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. J.D. Browning. New York, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Queen Anne*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Guibbory, Acshah. *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton: Literature, Religion and Cultural Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burgen and Frederick Lawrence. UK: Polity Press, 1989.
- Hackel, Heidi Brayman. *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Harris, Bob. *Politics and the Rise of the Press: Britain and France, 1620-1800*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Harris, Michael. "Newspaper Distribution During Queen Anne's Reign: Charles Delafaye and the Secretary of State's Office." In *Studies in the Book Trade: In Honor of Graham Pollard*, eds. R. W. Hunt, I. G. Philip and R. J. Roberts. Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society, 1975.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Print and Politics in the Age of Walpole." In *Britain in the Age of Walpole*, ed. Jeremy Black. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- Harris, Tim. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Problem of 'Popular Political Culture' in Seventeenth-Century London," *History of European Ideas* 19 (1989).
- Heyd, Michael. *"Be Sober and Reasonable": The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Houb, Richard. *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Methuen, 1984.
- Houlbrooke, Ralph. "'Public' and 'Private' in the Funerals of the Later Stuart Gentry: Some Somerset Examples," *Mortality* 1:2 (1996).
- Howell, P. "Public Space and the Public Sphere: Political Theory and the Historical Geography of Modernity," *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space* 11 (1993): 303-22.
- Hudson, Frederick. *Journalism in the United States from 1690 to 1872*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1873.
- Hunt, Alice. *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England*. Cambridge, 2009.
- Hunter, Heidi. *Colonial Women, Race and Culture in Stuart Drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Hyde, Melissa and Jennifer Milam, eds. *Women, art and the Politics of Identity in Eighteenth Century Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2003.
- Jacquot, Jean, ed. *Les Fêtes de la Renaissance*, Vols. 1-3. Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherché scientifique, 1956, 1960, 1975.
- Jussen, Bernhard. "The King's Two Bodies Today," *Representations* 106 (Spring 2009): 102-117.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Keay, Anna. *Magnificent Monarch*. Continuum, 2008.
- Kelly, Veronica and Dorothea E. von Mücke, eds. *Body & Text in the Eighteenth Century*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.



- Kenyon, John Phillip. *The Stuarts: A Study in English Kingship* (rev.edn.). Fontana Press, 1972.
- Kishlansky, Mark. *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*. London: Penguin, 1997.
- Klein, Benjamin. "Between the Bums and Bellies of the Multitude: Civic Pageantry and the Problem of Audience in Late Stuart London," *London Journal* 17:1 (1992): 18- 26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Royal Ceremony Celebration and Print in Later Stuart England 1660-1714." Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 2002.
- Knights, Mark. *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678 – 1681*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Public Politics in England c. 1675-c. 1715," in *The English Revolution c. 1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Kvande, Marta. *Everyday Revolutions: Eighteenth-Century Women Transforming Public and Private*. Cranbury, NJ: Rosemont Publishing and Printing Corp., 2008.
- Lake, Peter and Steve Pincus, eds. *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England," *Journal of British Studies* 45:2 (April 2006): 270 – 292.
- Laurier, Eric and Chris Philo. "'A Parcel of muddling muckworms': Revisiting Habermas and the English Coffee-houses," *Social and Cultural Geography* 8:2 (2007): 259-81.
- Laynesmith, Joanna, "Fertility Rite or Authority Ritual? The Queen's Coronation in England, 1445-87." In *Social Attitudes and Political Structures in the Fifteenth Century*, ed Tim Thornton. Stroud: Sutton, 2000.
- Lewis, I., ed. *Symbols and Sentiments: Cross-Cultural Studies in Symbolism*. Academic Press, 1977.
- MacLean, Sally-Beth. "Drama and Ceremony in Early Modern England: The REED Project," *Urban History Yearbook* (1989): 38-46.
- McClure, Ellen. *Sun Spots and the Sun King: Sovereignty and Mediation in Seventeenth-Century France*. Champagne, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2006.
- McConville, Brendan. *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

- McCorison, Marcus A. "Printers and the Law: The Trials of Publishing Obscene Libel in Early America." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 104:2 (2010): 181-217.
- McElligott, Jason, ed. *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2006.
- McGlynn, Catherine, Andrew Mycock and James W. McAuley. *Britishness, Identity and Citizenship: The View from Abroad*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011.
- McKendrick, Neil, John Brewer and J.H. Plumb. *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1982.
- McKeon, Michael. *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Melton, James Van Horn. *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Merrick, Jeffrey. *Desacralization of the French Monarchy in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1990.
- Miller, John. *Bourbon and Stuart Kings and Kingship in France and England in the Seventeenth Century*. London: George Philip, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Public Opinion in Charles II's England," *History* 80 (1995): 359-8.
- Monod, Paul. *The Power of Kings: Monarchy and Religion in Europe 1589-1715*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Montrose, Louis. *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender and Representation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, (sic?) 2006.
- Morgan, William Thomas. "The Five Nations and Queen Anne." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 14 (1927): 169-89.
- Mott, Frank. *American Journalism: A History of Newspaper in the United States Through 250 Years, 1690-1940*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1962.
- Mulryne, J.R., Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly and Margaret Shewing, eds. *Europa Triumphans: Court and Civic Festivals in Early Modern Europe*, Vols. I and II. Ashgate, 2004.
- Myers, Robin and Michael Harris, eds. *Aspects of Printing from 1600*. Oxford: Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Serials and their Readers, 1620-1914*. Winchester, Hampshire: St. Paul Bibliographies, 1993.
- Nord, David. *Communities of Journalism: A History of American Newspapers and their Readers*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2007.
- Norton, Mary Beth. *Founding Mothers & Father: Gendered Power and the Formation of American Society*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Separated by their Sex: Women in the Public and Private in the Colonial Atlantic World*. Cornell University Press, 2011.
- Novak, Maximillian E. and Anne Kostelanetz Mellor, eds. *Passionate Encounters in a Time of Sensibility*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000.
- O'Brien, Gerard. "The Unimportance of Public Opinion in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland," *Eighteenth-century Ireland : Iris an dá chultúr* 8 (1993): 115-27.
- Ogilby, John. Introduction to *The Entertainment of his Most Excellent Majestie Charles II in his Passage through the City of London to his Coronation*. Binghamton, NY: State University of New York, 1988.
- Orgel, Stephen. *Spectacular Performances: Essays on Theatre, Imagery, Books and Selves in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.
- Orr, Clarissa Cambell. *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Parsons, Nicola. *Reading Gossip in Early Eighteenth-Century England*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Paster, Gail Kern, Katherine Rowe and Mary Floyd-Wilson, eds. *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Peacey, Jason. "Perceptions of Parliament: Factions and the 'Public'." In *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640 – 1649*, ed. John S. A. Adamson. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Peters, Marie. "Historians and the Eighteenth-Century English Press: A Review of Possibilities and Problems," *Australian Journal of Politics & History* 34:1 (1988): 37-50.
- Plomer, H.R. *Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1688 to 1725*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

- Potter-MacKinnon, Janice. *While the Women Only Wept: Loyalist Refugee Women*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.
- Pritchard, Will. *Outward Appearances: The Female Exterior in Restoration London*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2008.
- Rafferty, Anne. *American Journalism 1690-1904*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Raymond, J. *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Newspaper, Public Opinion and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century," *Prose Studies* 21:2 (1998): 109-40.
- Reedy, G. "Mystical Politics: The Imagery of Charles II's Coronation." In *Studies in Change and Revolution: Aspects of English Intellectual History, 1640 – 1800*, ed. P. J. Korshin. Menston, 1972.
- Rétat, Pierre, ed. *Gazette d'Amsterdam: Miroir de l'Europe au XVIIIe Siècle*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2001.
- Richards, J. O. *Party Propaganda Under Queen Anne*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1972.
- Roberts, Julia. *In Mixed Company: Taverns and Public Life in Upper Canada*. Vancouver, BC: The University of British Columbia Press, 2009.
- Rogers, Pat. *Pope and the Destiny of the Stuarts: History, Politics, and Mythology in the Age of Queen Anne*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Rose, Jacqueline. *Godly Kingship in Restoration England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Runge, Laura L. and Pat Rogers, eds. *Producing the Eighteenth-Century Book: Writers and Publishers in England, 1650-1800*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2009.
- Rutland, Robert. *Newsmongers: Journalism in the Life of the Nation, 1690-1972*. New York: Doubleday, 1973.
- Rutledge, Douglas F., ed. *Ceremony and Text in the Renaissance*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1996.
- Schwoerer, Lois G. "Liberty of the Press and Public Opinion 1660-1695." In *Liberty Secured?: Britain Before and After 1688*, ed. James R. Jones. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.

- Scott, Jonathan. *When the Waves Ruled Britannia: Geography and Political Identities, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Scott, Hamish and Brendan Sims, eds. *Cultures of Power in Europe During the Long Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Shaw, Dougal. "Nothing but Propaganda? Historians and the Study of Early Modern Royal Ritual," *Cultural and Social History – The Journal of the Social History Society* 1:2 (2004): 139-58.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy 1660-1714*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Sharpe, Kevin and Steven Zwicker, eds. *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Sloan, William and Julie Williams. *The Early American Press, 1690-1783*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994.
- Smith, Hannah. "Last of all the Heavenly Birth": Queen Anne and Sacral Queenship," *Parliamentary History* (2009).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714-1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Smith, Jay M. *The Culture of Merit: Nobility, Royal Service and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France 1600-1789*. University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Smith, Thomas Lee. *A Missing Chapter of English Traditionalism: The Royal Maundy Ceremony during the Tudor-Stuart Period*. Ph.D. diss., Saint-Louis University, 1979.
- Smuts, Malcom. *Court Culture and the Origins of Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma: The English Royal Entry in London, 1485-1642." In *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honor of Lawrence*

- Stone. Eds. A. L. Beier, David Cannadine and James M. Rosenheim. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Snyder, Henry Leonard. "A Further Note on the Circulation of Newspapers in the Reign of Queen Anne." *The Library* 5:31 (1976): 387-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Reports of a Press Spy for Robert Harley: New Bibliographical Data for the Reign of Queen Anne." *The Library* 22:4 (1967): 326-45.
- Sommerville, J. *The News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information* (1996).
- Speck, W.A. *Literature and Society in Eighteenth-Century England 1680-1820*. London: Longman, 1998.
- Stafford, P. "'More than a Man or Less than a Woman?': Women Rulers in Early Modern Europe," *Gender History* 7 (1995).
- Staniland, Kay. "Royal Entry into the World." In *England in the Fifteenth-Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*. Ed. Daniel Williams. Woodbridge, 1987.
- Stevens, David. *Party Politics and English Journalism 1702-1714*, New York, 1967.
- Strocchia, Sharon. *Death and Ritual in Renaissance Florence*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Strong, Roy. *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450-1650*. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Coronation. A History of Kingship and the British Monarchy*. Harper Collins, 2005.
- Sutherland, James. *The Restoration Newspaper and its Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Sutherland, Lucy Stuart. "Edmund Burke and the Relations Between Members of Parliament and their Constituents," *Studies in Burke & His Time* 10:33 (1968): 1005-21.
- Teague, Frances. "Queen Elizabeth in her Speeches." In *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*, eds. Susan Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies. New York and London, 1992.
- Thompson, Peter. *Rum, Punch and Revolution: Taverngoing and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia*. Early American Studies. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

- Trevelyan, George Macaulay, ed. *Select Documents for Queen Anne's Reign Down to the Union with Scotland. 1702-7*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929.
- Turberville, Arthur Stanley. *English Men and Manners in the Eighteenth Century, an Illustrated Narrative*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
- Turner, Victor. *The Anthropology of Performance*. New York: PAJ Publications, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974.
- Van Der Cruysse, Dirk. "Entre les Stuarts, les Oranges et les Hanovre: Madame Palatine et l'Angleterre." In *France et Grande-Gretagne de la Chute de Charles Ier à celle des Jaques II (1649 – 1688)*, eds. Christopher Smith, Elfrieda Dubois. Norwich, 1990.
- Walzer, Michael. "On the Role of Symbolism in Political Thought," *Political Science Quarterly* 132:2 (June 1967): 191-204.
- Weber, Harold. *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1996.
- Weil, Rachel Judith. "The Female Politician in the Late Stuart Age." In *Politics, Transgression and Representation at the Court of Charles II*. (2007)
- Werrett, Simon. "Healing the Nation's Wounds: Royal Ritual and Experimental Philosophy in Restoration England," *History of Science* 38:4 (2000): 377 – 99.
- Wilson, Kathleen. *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture, and Imperialism in England, 1715 – 1785*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Winn, James A. "Style and Politics in the Phillips-Handel Ode for Queen Anne's Birthday 1713," *Music & Letters* 89:4 (2008): 547-61.
- Wintroub, Michael. "Civilizing the Savage and Making a King: The Royal Entry Festival of Henry II (Rouen 1550)," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 29:2 (Summer, 1998): 465-94.
- Withington, R. *English Pageantry: An Historical Outline*. Cambridge, MA, 1918.
- Wolf, Edwin II. *The Book Culture of a Colonial American City: Philadelphia Books, Bookmen and Booksellers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Zaller, Robert. "Break the Vessels: The Desacralization of Monarchy in Early Modern England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 29:3 (1998): 757-778.
- Zaret, David. *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

## VITA

Amy Oberlin was raised in Nashville, Tennessee, where she attended Vanderbilt University from 1999 to 2003. She began her studies at Vanderbilt as a music major with a focus in oboe performance. In her sophomore year, she changed her major to History and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in History in December 2003.

In 2006 she began her graduate studies in History at Loyola University Chicago, where she first earned a Master of Arts degree in History in 2009, before deciding to pursue her Ph.D. at Loyola. While at Loyola, Oberlin served as Faculty Liaison for the Graduate Student Association from 2008 to 2009, and organized the Dissertation Writing Group for the History Department from 2012 to 2015. She was also awarded the Loyola University Merit Award from 2012 to 2015.

During her graduate studies, Oberlin also served as an adjunct instructor at the College of DuPage, Benedictine University and Loyola University Chicago. In 2014, she published an article based on her early dissertation research in the journal, *Parergon*.

Oberlin currently serves as a Senior Associate, Investigations and Disputes for Kroll Associates Inc. in Chicago, Illinois. She lives in Berwyn, Illinois.